













THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

VOL. II.

PUBLISHED IN

DECEMBER, 1836, & APRIL, 1837.



LONDON:  
WILLIAM SPOONER, 377, STRAND;  
LONDON; 80, MARLBOROUGH STREET, DUBLIN,  
AGENTS FOR IRELAND: W. TAIT, EDINBURGH;  
R. STUART AND CO. GLASGOW.

—  
1837.

LONDON: J. RICHARDS, PRINTER, ST. MARTIN'S LANE.

Uttarpore Jalakrishna Public Library  
Acn No. 5671..... Date 13/1/75

# CONTENTS

OF

No. III.

	Page
I.—1. Account of the 'Edinburgh Sessional School. By J. Wood. Edinburgh, 8vo. 1834	-
2. Chambers' Educational Course. 12mo. Edinburgh, 1835	-
3. Practical Remarks upon the Education of the Working Classes; with an Account of the Plan pursued, &c. &c. at the Brenton Asylum, Hackney-Wick. By Charles Forss. 1835.	-
II.—1. The Catholic Church; Five Sermons preached in the Parish Church of Blackburne, on occasion of the commemoration of the Reformation, celebrated October 4th, 1835. By the Rev. J. Whittaker, D.D.	-
2. The Duty of contending for the Faith; A Sermon preached in the Church of St. John, Swansea, on Sunday, October 4th, 1835. By the Rev. Henry Roxby Maude, LL.B.	-
3. The Prevalence of Popery considered; A Sermon preached in Mount Sion Chapel, Tunbridge Wells, on Lord's day evening, October 4th, 1835. By B. Slight	35
III.—1. Third Report of the Commissioners for enquiring into the Condition of the Poorer Classes in Ireland	-
2. The Evils of the State of Ireland, their Causes, and their Remedy—A Poor Law. By John Revans	51
IV.—The Progress of the Nation, in its various Social and Economical Relations, from the beginning of the Nineteenth Century to the Present time. By G.R. Porter, Esq. 8vo. London, 1836	95
V.—1. The Book of Beauty. Edited by the Countess of Blessington. 8vo. London, 1836	-
2. The Keepsake. Edited by the Lady Emmeline Stuart Wortley. 8vo. London, 1836	-
3. The Confessions of an Elderly Gentleman. By the Countess of Blessington. 8vo. London, 1836	-
4. Adventures of Bilberry Thurland. 3 vols 8vo. London, 1836	-
5. The Life and Works of Cowper. By Robert Southey, Esq. LL.D. Poet Laureat. Vols. 1-8. London, 1836	111

- VL.—1. *The Case of Maynooth College considered, with a History of the first establishment of that Seminary; an Account of the System of Education pursued in it; and a Review of the effect it has had on the character of the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland.* Dublin, 1836 - - - - -
2. *Maynooth in 1834.* By Eugene Francis O'Beirne, late Student at Maynooth College. New Edition. Dublin, 1835 - - - - -
3. *Eighth Report on Education in Ireland, with the Appendix. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 19th June, 1829* - - - - - 129
- VII.—*Beitrage zur Kirchengeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts in Deutschland. Materials for the Ecclesiastical History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century.* 8vo. Augsburg. 1835 - - - - - 168
- VIII.—*Sketches of English Literature, with Considerations on the Spirit of the Times, Men, and Revolutions.* By the Viscount de Chateaubriand. 2 vols. 8vo. Colburn, London, 1836 - - - - - 187
- IX.—1. *The Edinburgh Review on Absenteeism.* (No. 85, Nov. 1825). - - - - -
2. *Evidence of J. R. McCulloch, Esq. before the Committee of 1830, on the State of the Irish Poor.* (Third Report of Evidence, ordered to be printed, July 16, 1830.) - - - - - 199
- X.—1. *A History of British Fishes.* By William Yarrell, V.P.Z.S., F.L.S. Illustrated by nearly 400 wood-cuts. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1836 - - - - -
2. *An Angler's Rambles.* By Edward Jesse, Esq. F.L.S. Author of "Gleanings in Natural History." 8vo. London, 1836 - - - - - 216
- XI.—*Report of a Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Royal Dublin Society. Ordered to be printed in the Session of 1836* - - - - - 226
- XII.—1. *The Vespers of Palermo. A Tragedy, in Five Acts.* - - - - -
2. *The Siege of Valencia. A Dramatic Poem.* By Felicia Hemans. London, 1823. - - - - -
3. *The Forest Sanctuary, with Lays of Many Lands.* By Felicia Hemans. London - - - - -
4. *Records of Women, with other Poems.* By Felicia Hemans. Edinburgh, 1828 - - - - -
5. *Scenes and Hymns of Life, with other Religious Poems.* By Felicia Hemans. Edinburgh, 1834 - - - - -
6. *Poetical Remains of the late Mrs. Hemans.* Edinburgh, 1836 - - - - -
7. *Memorials of Mrs. Hemans, with Illustrations of her Literary Character, from her Private Correspondence.* By Henry F. Chorley. 2 vols. London, 1836 - - 245

# CONTENTS

OF

## No. IV.

ART.	Page
I.—1. The Life of John Hunter, F.R.S., (prefixed to a New Edition of his Works, by J. F. Palmer.) By Drewry Ottley, Esq. 8vo. 1837.—pp. 197.	
2. The Hunterian Oration, delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons, February 14, 1834. By William Lawrence, F.R.S. 8vo. 1834.—pp. 50.	
3. The Hunterian Oration, delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons, February 14, 1837. By Sir Benjamin C. Brodie, Bart., F.R.S. 8vo. 1837.—pp. 38.	277
II.—Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion. 2 vols. 8vo. By the Reverend Nicholas Wiseman, D.D. Booker, London. 1836.	293
III.—Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.	329
IV.—Théorie Analytique des Probabilités; par M. le Marquis de Laplace, &c. &c. 3ème édition. Paris, 1820.	338
V.—1. De la Démocratie en Amérique. Par Alexis de Tocqueville, Avocat à la Cour Royal de Paris, l'un des Auteurs du Livre, intitulé "Du Système pénitentière, aux Etats Unis." Bruxelles, 1835.	
2. The Americans in their Moral, Social, and Political Relations. By Francis J. Grund. London, 1837.	354
VI.—1. The Daughter. A Play, in Five Acts. By James Sheridan Knowles, author of "Virginia," &c. London, 1837.	
2. Cosmo de' Medici. An Historical Tragedy. By R. H. Horne, author of "The Exposition of the False Medium," &c. London, 1837.	
3. Marcus Manlius. A Tragedy, in Five Acts. By David Elwin Colombine. London, 1837.	367
VII.—1. Great Protestant Meeting. Franklin, Dublin.	
2. A Familiar Epistle to Sergeant Jackson. Ridgway, London.	409
VIII.—1. Memoirs of the Life of Sir Humphry Davy, Bart. LL.D., F.R.S., Foreign Associate of the Institute of France. By John Davy, M.D., F.R.S. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1836.	



2. Consolations in Travel, or, The Last Days of a Philosopher., Third edition. London, 1831.	
3. <i>Salmonia</i> . Third edition. London, 1833.	- 437
IX.—A new Version of the Four Gospels, with Notes, Critical and Explanatory. By a Catholic. London. 1836.	475
X.—1. A Letter to Archdeacon Singleton, on the Ecclesiastical Commission, by the Rev. Sydney Smith. London, 1837.	
2. Quarterly Review for February 1837, Article VII.	
3. Pusey on Cathedral Institutions.. London, 1833. 2nd edit.	- 493
XI.—1. Affairs of the East, in connexion with Russia and England. Second Edition. Ridgway.	
2. Metropolitan Magazine, February 1834. — Article, Turkey.	
3. Russia and Turkey. By Urquhart. London. Ridgway.	509
XII.—1. <i>Xeniola</i> —Poems and Translations, from Schiller and De la Motte Fouqué. By John Anster, LL.D. Dublin, 1837.	
2. Corn Law Rhymes and Poems. By Ebenezer Elliott. 3 vols. Benjamin Steill. London, 1834 and 1835.	547
XIII.—Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, by Henry Lord Bishop of Exeter, at his triennial Visitation, 1836. London, 8vo.	
2. Observations on the Roman Catholic Oath. By a Roman Catholic. Ridgway. London, 1837. 8vo.	563
XIV.—Declaration of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. 12mo. Dublin, 1835.	584
XV.—Summary Review of French Catholic Literature, from September 1836 to March 1837.	- 588
Miscellaneous Intelligence.	- 603
Supplementary Note to "Persecution of Catholics in Prussia."	- 613



THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW

DECEMBER, 1836.

ART. 1. *Account of the Edinburgh Sessional School.* By J. Wood. Edinburgh, 8vo. 1834.

2. *Chambers' Educational Course.* 12mo. Edinburgh. 1835.

3. *Practical Remarks upon the Education of the Working Classes; with an Account of the Plan pursued, &c. &c. at the Brenton Asylum, Hackney-Wick.* By Charles Forss. 1835.

THE "Schoolmaster is abroad," is one of those sayings which, becoming the watchwords of contending factions, are already in vogue, before any one has given himself the time or trouble to weigh well their grounds or meaning. It is to one party a word of gathering; to another, of denunciation: to one, every thing typical of progression, to another of decline and disorder. Both have given it far too much importance. The schoolmaster is abroad, but we have yet to look for the educator.

It was a saying of Talleyrand's, "que l'éducation de l'Angleterre, était la meilleure de l'Europe, et puis c'était détestable." To the first part of this sentence we have long ceased to have any pretensions; we have still to wipe off the reproach of the second. The education of England, in all its grades, is still detestable, that is, where there is any education at all. A few years ago, Lord Brougham made a declaration, at a public meeting in Yorkshire, quite as bold; and though the answers to Lord Kerry's queries, have flattered us into a belief, that since that period we have made signal progress, and may now look the neighbouring nations in the face without shame, a very little reflection on the true nature of the question "sub judice," and some inquiry into the evidences offered for its support, will teach us that we are yet on the threshold, and, as far as the nation at large is concerned, have absolutely to begin. The fact is, we have no precise idea of what we are looking for—educationists, and anti-educationists, are contending about everything else but education. Schoolmasters and school-houses are, in the mind of four-fifths of these gentlemen, the sum total of education. To hear them talk, one

would think that both parties were quite convinced they could teach with brick and mortar. If one man asks another how education is advancing in any particular school, he is instantly favoured with a sort of Almack's list of patrons and patronesses, none of whom have probably ever visited the institution in question; many of whom cannot, probably, recollect its name; coronets are mistaken for contributors, and committees for management; a charity dinner, with its accompanying duties and penalties, submits it once a-year, indeed, to the bespoken panegyric of the public, but there the "bore" ends—the country has nothing to say to it till the ensuing anniversary, and in the meantime all the world are satisfied that "education is advancing." If a man stands up in a public meeting, and entreates support for education, he has to occupy full three-fourths of the time of the public, in merely explaining his definitions, and gathering his auditors up to the level of his language. In the House of Commons the case is still more discouraging; if any doubt be expressed of the progress of "public instruction," (by the bye, a very narrow and exclusive term,) he is silenced by an overwhelming array of figures, and other financial mystifications. There are so many hundred school-rooms, so many thousand desks and forms, all unequivocally costing money, and all paid as unequivocally by the country; and after that, no one can be so indecent as to question whether education is advancing. It advances, as the Exchequer avers, most expensively and most magnificently. If any effort be made to give these contributions of the Government somewhat of a regular and organised form, an instant alarm is expressed at this unheard-of intrusion on private rights. A minister rises and begins his objections to these *doctrinaire* novelties, with a panegyric on the Voluntary system. It has already worked so well, and it is now working so much better, and it would be such a pity to disturb it in this rapid progress to perfection! Then comes the old saw, "*laissez-nous faire*;" which in ministerial mouths means simply, let us and our places alone. All this might be exceedingly wise and proper, if it were true; but the truth is directly the other way: the Voluntary system, the *laissez faire* system has not worked well, but has worked as ill as any system well could do. It has not even built school-houses, or filled those it has built with schoolboys. Mind has, of course, been a secondary consideration, or more accurately, in nine cases out of ten, it does not seem to have been a consideration at all. The Voluntary system has placed England at the bottom of the scale of European education. It has left her to blunder and to stumble as she likes. Exceptions doubtless there are, as there must be even under the worst arrangements. It is hard for every one, in so many millions of men, even with the strongest

encouragement, to go wrong. Accordingly, there are a few redeeming gleams of light, we candidly acknowledge; up and down, a school will be found, in the midst of all this barrenness, bearing the sound fruits of a judicious and laborious culture:—up and down, a teacher worthy of the high name—earnestly, and humbly, and wisely fulfilling a vocation to which, in spirit and truth, he has been called, may perchance be discovered; but he works in the darkness of the mine, he is not known beyond its limits; he is known only by the treasures, which, without being seen himself, he scatters around. These men are few, and regarded even when they work good, with fear and mistrust, like the alchemist of yore. In many places, the very parents, whose children derive from them all profit, look on them and their magic art with trembling. As every one in these favoured realms, believes himself or herself *born* an educationist, as we are all organically politicians, every one undertakes, as a matter of course, to teach the teacher. One calls on him, with the text of the Proverbs in his mouth, to be sure to whip well; another to cram well; a third to punish; a fourth to reward; one is for the Assembly's Catechism and the Book of Leviticus, another for Entick's Speaker and the Eton Grammar;—and as all are in contradiction to each other, and as all believe themselves right, it is a matter of no surprise they should at last compel the unfortunate reformer to surrender at discretion, and to give up his innovations, if he wishes to keep his scholars or salary. The great mass of our public schools thus flourish, as of old, in the perfectly undisturbed enjoyment of all their venerable absurdities. Drowsyhead and miseducation thrive unmolested; the twig is bent and espalliered after the old blundering orthodox fashion. Year after year fresh batches of laboriously fashioned blockheads are sent out to join the old, and in the mean time education is said to be rapidly advancing. All society feel the happy results in every possible shape, and yet is it still groping about for the causes which have produced them. We acknowledge that the conduct of masses must depend upon the conduct of individuals; and that of individuals, again, upon their intelligence and character. And yet it is this very character and this very intelligence, the original center-spring of the whole machine, upon the shaping of which we scarcely bestow a thought. We find at every step, our most benevolent wishes, our wisest designs, rendered null, by these obstacles. What are the unaccountable prejudices, the virulent party hostility, the sectarian animosities, the mistaken views of legislation and administration, with which, for years, the highest minds have to struggle, but, under one shape or other, manifestations of the one evil, early miseducation. It seems never to enter the mind of these learned Thebans, who rail against actual evils and difficulties,

that these effects do not grow up in a night,—that the creature must have a creator,—that men do not make themselves, but are so made by circumstances;—and that, if they are to have a community such as they would wish, they must begin with the community as they would with the individual, in the *nursery*. A prison will waste the fairest cheek, and cripple into deformity the stoutest and noblest form that ever came from the hand of the Creator. Has not the mind as well as the body its fetters, and prisons, its noisome and crippling dungeons and enduring glooms? Not on the captive, but on the captive's keeper; not on society as it is made, but on those who made it such; not on the grown man, with his crimes and follies, but on those who planted the vices of the grown-man in the yet untainted child, should we pour out the vials of our indignation. It is a question, indeed, how far society can with any justice punish crimes which it actually produces, or whether every criminal, miseducated through its negligence, is not a victim to blind and indiscriminate cruelty. The state, in such a case, is not merely a participator, but the principal, in the guilt; the maker of the bad law, or the legislator who neglects to make a good one, has better title than the convict to his place in the dock. But these are truths, which so far from being felt by those who make the laws, are not even understood by those for whom the laws are destined; if they were, they would not receive education as a tardily vouchsafed boon; they would stand up and demand it as a right, as an essential.

The public mind is not yet turned steadily and generally to such inquiries; the great mass of our people not only do not know what education really is, but do not feel that it is, or can be, made a blessing. Individuals, it is possible, feel these doctrines, and worship in secret, but their faith is not that of the world without. Some of our larger towns loath the chaff, and hunger after substantial food. Manchester, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Belfast, know that there is an education, believe in it, seek for it, but their efforts are confined to their own precincts—to their local daily experiment; they have slight interchange with each other; they work in parallel lines—the advance is zig-zag—the progress is provincial. We have no approach sufficiently determinate yet, notwithstanding the occasional intimations at public meetings, the echoes of the press, or the experiments, tried in many instances successfully in private, of a true commonwealth feeling on the subject. There are educations, but no national education. The government itself, in this particular, is behind the legislature, as the legislature is behind the people; and now and then opens its eyes, but it is merely to shut them again. They allow education and miseducation to fight it out, content with the very easy part of a spectator. In the meantime it is quite clear,

one or other must prevail. Under a plea of not impelling education, they virtually support miseducation. Parties fight *ad internecionem*, about rail-road or turnpike acts, and to this upon which all acts must depend, without whose life-giving spirit all acts are mere waste paper, to this, they are wisely and virtuously indifferent.

The grand apology for all this notorious negligence, is one and simple. "There is such difference of opinion upon the question, and it is so difficult to conciliate opinions."! Both of these allegations are doubtless true, and yet neither is the slightest argument for delay or indolence. The difference of opinions literally rises from this very delay, and the difficulty in reconciling them proceeds solely from our thinking them irreconcilable, from the want of communication, inquiry, and discussion. Let partisans approach each other, study and understand each other, and their partisanship in nine cases out of ten, will vanish. The grounds of opposition are not those which are put forward. The assumed grounds are easily scattered,—of the real they are ashamed. But true or false, they are not likely to be got rid of, by not being touched. Activity, sincerity, accuracy, and decision, are required, but even the slightest portion of such qualities, are surely likely to do more than absolute repose. When we come to examine the causes which retard the progress of national education in this country, in good faith, and with a frank and earnest desire to remove them, we shall be surprised to find them so little formidable. "Est leo in viâ," is the old excuse of the sluggard, but let him take the resolution of meeting it, and he will find the lion a sheep.

The cause of education has had in many cases to suffer almost as much from its friends as from its foes. There are three descriptions of antagonists with which it has to contend; the anti-educationists, the indifferents, and the educationists themselves. Each of these, with the reasoning and conduct of each, requires some remark.

The anti-educationists are a large and multifarious class; the parson and the peasant are to be found in the same ranks. The latter thinks it will interfere with his pounds, shillings, and pence, by abstracting children from their labour; the former imagines, it will upset the orders, dislocate society, overturn the Church, extinguish livings, and send Churchmen and their children to the byways and highways of beggary. One of our Tory contemporaries heads a series of appalling prophecies on social disorganisation with "*The Schoolmaster*." He might as well head it with "*The Gospel*." True it is that crime has not yet ceased upon the earth, nor is it likely it ever will. We do not cherish the "fond imagining," that education, nor even christianity, will thoroughly eradicate it. "It is necessary that scandal cometh." Both coexist

with crime: crime advances in despite of both; but neither surely, without flagrant impiety, can be said to advance, or not to check, crime. The "*non causa pro causâ*" is the most common of all political sophisms. It is the "*cheval de bataille*" of those gentlemen. To make good such a proposition, it would have been requisite to have shewn, first, that crime had really increased, and secondly, that it had increased in consequence of what might legitimately have been termed education. In both showings they have signally failed. There is not the augmentation they speak of: what does exist, arises not from the extension, but from the want or imperfection of education.

There have been two parties on this question, both in extremes. Dupin and Lucas maintained that the diminution of crime was in direct ratio with the diffusion of public instruction. They imagined that the improvement of intellectual culture of itself, was decidedly in favour of the improvement of public morals. They grounded this position on two observations; that in the northern provinces of France, where there was a greater degree of information, there was also a less degree of crime; and secondly, that the majority of French criminals knew not how to read or write. In 1829, half of those who appeared before the assizes, did not know how to read or write; 1-10th only had received a very imperfect education; and 1-76th only had really acquired any real degree of instruction. The error in this position, arises from too exclusive a consideration of intellectual education, and measuring its progress by the extension given to it in a mere material sense, without taking into account the spirit which presided over it, and the direction which it received. The labours of M. Balbi, and more recently of M. Guerry, have placed this in a more palpable point of view, and shewn that neither the number of schools or scholars, nor any degree of intellectual culture, is a sufficiently accurate scale by which to measure the state of national morality. In the department of the Marne, the proportion of scholars to population was as 1 to 10 inhabitants, and of criminals, as 1 to 6219. In the department of the Haute Loire, there is but, 1 scholar to 268 inhabitants, and 1 criminal only to 26,000 inhabitants. The department of the Corrèze, has 1 scholar for every 128 inhabitants, and 1 murderer only in 427,000 inhabitants. In the department of the Haut Rhin, the number of children frequenting schools, is to the population as 1 to 13, and yet, there is 1 assassin to every 94,000 souls. Intellectual culture cannot then be said of itself to prevent crime. On the contrary, there are cases in which it may possibly tend to encourage it; but to say, as late writers have asserted, grounding it upon M. Guerry's work, that it "*greatly increases it*," is equally erroneous. M. Guerry was not satisfied with Dupin's

calculations, or the basis on which they reposed; he thought, that something more specific than schools or scholars was required to determine the amount of instruction. He compared, not the number of scholars, but the number of readers and writers, with the number of accused, and drew conclusions not less unfavourable than those just mentioned, to the moral influence of intellectual culture. The criterion suggested by Guerry, has been applied, if possible, with less discrimination to our English and Scotch returns. In the report made to the Middlesex Magistrates by the Chaplain of Coldbath Fields prison, we have the very vague term education still adopted, but it is to be presumed, not meant to extend beyond reading or writing, or more probably reading. From this return, the deductions are also against "education." Out of 967 prisoners, the "uneducated" furnished only 104, the "educated" not less than 863, of which 265 had been imprisoned before. The Chaplain draws from this inquiry his conclusion, that it is not the want of "education," but the absence of principle (as if education and the inculcation of principle, were totally different matters) which lead to crime. The Glasgow Bridewell return is more specific, but still inadequate. Out of a total of 326 prisoners in the year, June 1834, June 1835, 131 could read and write, 143 read only, and 52 could do neither one nor the other. This preponderance of educated prisoners over uneducated, is still stronger in the male than in the female sex, and seems to augment in proportion as you ascend. There are 98 male prisoners who can read and write, and only 24 who cannot; a phenomenon, however, which may be accounted for on very different grounds from those stated. It is right, however, now to look to the other side of the question.

M. Ducpétiaux gives the following return, of the proportion of instructed to accused, (*état intellectuel des accusés*) during five successive years, from 1828 to 1832, in France.

Year.	Accused, whose degree of education could be ascertained.	Not knowing how to read or write.	Reading and writing imperfectly.	Reading and writing well.	Superior the last degree.
1828,	6922	4166	1858	780	118
1829,	7369	4523	1947	729	170
1830,	6962	4319	1826	688	129
1831,	7604	4600	2047	767	190
1832,	7565	4540	2192	682	151

The returns annually published by the Minister of War, of the number of young men called to recruit the army, give, in 1828, 53 to 100, as the proportion of those who do not know how to read and write to those who do. In 1829, it was only 52 to 100.



It is now still less. Making every allowance for the exclusion of females from this last account, and their being included in the return above noticed, the result is highly favourable to education.

In the returns of the number of prisoners in the Bagnes of France, in 1830-1831, 3551 knew how to read, 6969 were totally without instruction.

An important article in criminal returns, is the tendency to the repetition of crime. The facts, in this particular, are also favourable to the influence of instruction.

Years.	Accused of a repetition of crime.	Not knowing how to read or write.	Reading and writing imperfectly.	Reading and writing well.	Superior to the last degree.
1828, .	1182	730	327	116	9
1829,	1334	818	378	114	24
1830, .	1370	870	357	125	18
1831,	1296	799	341	130	26
1832,	1429	857	422	131	19

or are these results confined to France. The data furnished by M. Luchlet and Lieber, prove that, similar effects follow the same cause in France, Belgium, and America. They have been reduced to the following table in Mr. Gregg's report.

*All kinds of Criminals.*

Degree of Education.	France.	Belgium.	America.
None,	610	610	256
Very imperfect,	266	150	551
Decent,	103	200	180
Superior,	21	40	13

Eighty-one per cent. of the crimes committed, thus appear to have been perpetrated by persons having received no education, or a very imperfect one; only 19 per cent. by those having the benefit of a decent, or a superior one.

These results will at least shew, that even with these imperfect data, and indistinct statements of the question to be determined, there are as strong presumptions in favour of the salutary influence, even of existing education, as against it. But the question deserves to be examined more narrowly.

It is asserted, in reference to the augmentation of population, that crime, in the gross, has augmented generally in Europe. There are, however, strong exceptions.

In Prussia, the Rhenish provinces included, the population increased, from 1817 to 1830, from 9,000,000 to 10,000,000. In 1817, the number of criminal and correctional offences were 10,936, in 1820, 27,488, and in 1830, 32,555.

In Denmark, 1 in 620 inhabitants was condemned to severe penalties in 1829, and 1 in 580 in 1830.

In France, however, and Belgium, crime has been nearly stationary. Crimes against the person have actually diminished. M. Guerry observes, that from 1825 to 1830 included, the greatest variation in crimes against the person each year, has not exceeded 0.25 of their number; and that the maximum at the same time, of crimes against property, has been reduced to 1-50th. In Belgium, in 1826, the former class of crimes might be represented by 188 to 1000 inhabitants; in 1830, they were 160 to 1000; crimes against property in 1826, were 190, and in 1827, 205; and in 1830, the same number. In the interval, the population had considerably augmented.

In the Austrian States, Hungary not included, crime has considerably diminished. In 1819, there was a total of 10,709, in 1822, of 10,440, and in 1823, 8,765. This is the more remarkable, as, during a portion of that time, crime had greatly increased in numbers and atrocity in some parts of the Austrian dominions. In Dalmatia, in 1810, there were 828 criminals to 318,000 inhabitants; in 1823, there were 1523; at a still later period, there was 1 criminal to every 206. Nor were these crimes of a light complexion; for, in the return just referred to, there were 179 murders, 200 burnings (premeditated), and 304 serious acts of violence and assault. Austria, within these last twenty years, has made great and successful efforts for education. Dalmatia is, perhaps, the most ignorant portion of her whole state.

In England, crimes have continued to encrease, especially those against property.

This disproportion is strongly illustrated by a comparison with other countries.—Taking 100 brought to trial—

Country.	Against the Person.	Against Property.
In England,	4	96
In France, (crimes)	27	73
In Belgium, (idem)	26	74

The same result is still more striking in comparison with Ireland.

From 1826 to 1832, the number of offences has been nearly stationary in Ireland, whilst in England it has been on the encrease; but the contrast between the number of criminals is remarkable. There has been 1 person brought to trial for every 484 inhabitants in Ireland, and only 1 for 733 in England, in the period from 1827 to 1833. The character of crime is not more strongly contrasted. Crimes against the person are nine times more numerous in Ireland than in England, whilst crimes against property are three time more numerous in England than in Ireland.

The proportion between crimes against the person, to crimes against property, in England, is as 1 to 25, and in Ireland as 0.86 to 1. It is also to be remarked, that crimes, especially against property, are considerably more frequent in the manufacturing than in the agricultural districts throughout England and Scotland, and have increased in almost direct proportion to the commercial prosperity of the town. This, indeed, may be extended generally to England,—the proportion of such increase, to that of crimes against the person, from 1810 to 1812, was as 1 to 16, from 1827 to 1833, as 1 to 25.\*

The progress, then, of crime, seems to be totally independent of the extension of education. It has arisen from circumstances co-existing with that extension. Amongst them, in England may be reckoned the diffusion of her manufacturing and commercial speculations, tending strongly to produce a greater necessity and desire for acquisition; in Ireland, the state of political effervescence and agitation in which she has been so long placed. It is in the very nature of luxury to produce inequality, and inequality to produce offenders against property. Another peculiarity in this class of offences, is the difficulty with which they are eradicated. The proportion of repetitions (*recidives*) of crimes against the person, is as 13 to 100 of those already committed; of crimes against property, as 80 to 100. These new offences, by the same persons, go to augment the sum total, but can scarcely be considered as indicative of a generally increasing and extending immorality. It is a characteristic of a peculiar state of society, arising from want,—for rich countries may be indigent, and poor countries comfortable; and it would be a great mistake to draw from thence conclusions, either against poverty or riches. It is the fair distribution of wealth and justice in a country, which chiefly tends to the diminution of crimes against property or person. Where these conditions are obviously wanting, it would be unfair to charge the consequences of such defect upon any other cause, less adequate to produce it.

In addition to these real principles of evil, there are other causes which have tended to swell in appearance the catalogue of crimes. A greater number have, if we may use the expression, been brought to charge. More vigilance in the Police, more decision in the

---

\* The very circumstance of condensation, or increase of relative population, in any given place, has also its influence. The very curious results detailed in Baron Dupin's paper at the late meeting of the British Association, go far to establish, on this question, laws, in accord with the conclusions drawn from the other data noticed in the text. At the same time there is a maximum, beyond which the powers to produce these effects, in some degree diminishes.

Juries, a milder code of penal law, have materially added to the committals and convictions for minor offences; and, mark, not an augmentation of immorality, but rather of morality, in the country. This result is very conspicuous, in comparing the returns of England and Ireland. In 100 individuals, brought to trial in 7 years, from 1826 to 1832 included, in England and Ireland, the proportions have been—

	England.	Ireland.
Not prosecuted, -	10	24
Acquitted, -	19	16
Convicted, -	71	60

Thus shewing that the efficiency of the law is considerably greater in England.\*

But were it quite possible to trace these consequences to the spread of education, the anti-educationist is bound not to stop here. He should distinctly shew the proportion of education to population, before he attempted to establish its proportion to crime. It is not pretended that it will extirpate, though it may check, evil tendencies; and if the great mass of a country is instructed, it is quite obvious, even with a small amount of crime, that the number of educated criminals must necessarily preponderate over those who are uneducated. This is strongly illustrated in the Glasgow Bridewell return. The total of Scotch prisoners (male) is 236, of Irish 60; the readers and writers amongst the first amount to 76, the readers only to 36, and the wholly ignorant to 9; the readers and writers among the Irish are 9, the readers only, are 25, and the wholly ignorant are 12. Did we not take into consideration the far more general diffusion of reading and writing amongst the Scotch than amongst the low Irish inhabitants of Glasgow, a conclusion, directly the reverse of the truth, would necessarily be come to. It would be supposed that Scotch education was favourable to vice, and Irish ignorance to virtue.

Nor is it fair to compare an intermediate state of knowledge and instruction, whose results, it is obvious, have not yet been developed with a state of crime, which, in great measure, is the result of a former condition of society. If instruction and its absence are to be compared,—if it is broadly to be maintained, that so far from repressing crime, instruction tends greatly to encrease it,—we see no reason why the educationist should not require on his side to go into the whole of the argument. If non-instruction be a benefit, so is ignorance, and he may fairly demand to test it by its results. The railer against the incomplete character of the bless-

---

\* At the same time, we must not forget that committals on light or insufficient grounds, are much more frequent in Ireland, than in Scotland.

ings of instruction, should be compelled to compare instruction and ignorance, face to face. They who murmur against present men, ought to cast their eyes back upon those who preceded them. The "trois jours" may fairly stand beside the first outbreak of the French Revolution. The petitions against tithes, against the insurrections of the White Boys, the Catholic Associators against the rioters of Lord George Gordon. The further back we go, the triumphs of ignorance ought to be more remarkable; and so forth they are. Would the writer in Blackwood advise the restoration of Scotland, to the "organization" of the days of Fletcher of Saltoun? Would he recommend a renewal of the good uninstructed times, which led to the Irish civil wars of 1641? Would he think the English yeomen more secure in life and property, were the ignorance and vagabondage, which the gibbet and sword were both unequal to suppress, again to overrun this land, as in the time of Henry VII.? If we are to have philippics against instruction, and encomiums on ignorance, let us have them frank and full. It is too ridiculous to take the part for the whole; and because virtue was not quite extinguished by ignorance, and is not quite rescued from the obstacles which throng around her, by instruction—to conclude, that ignorance is the mother of virtue, and vice the daughter of instruction.

But the real fact is, that the anti-educationists do not well know what education is. If every word they uttered were true, it would not prove one jot against education. Education is not instruction, any more than it is books, boards, or schoolrooms. Instruction, as well as gymnastics, is only a branch of education, and it would be just as great a folly to expect regeneration from one alone, as from the other. Education is literally "bringing up"—but not one section or fraction of the triple man, but the whole—physical, intellectual, moral—the body, the intelligence, the spirit. Leave out any one portion, and you at once overturn the balance, and produce a mass of distortion—a monster. Educate the body at the expense of the intellectual and moral being, and you produce a brute lump of animated clay. Educate the intelligence at the expense of the moral and religious feelings, and you give power without virtue to wield it. Educate the moral only, and you leave virtue without her noblest ally,—religion, without understanding, becomes fanaticism. Now, the very "education" of which they complain, is one or other of these *ex parte* educations, and it is only marvellous that it has not produced more evil and less good than it has done. When we speak of education, it is not of this abuse that we speak. We look for something better than Dame-schools, where children learn just

enough to make them dislike learning; or parochial schools, where Cato's soliloquy, or Hamlet's speech to the ghost, is the great criterion of their useless accomplishments; or commercial schools, where cyphering and bookkeeping form the great ethical preparation for after-life:—

“Romani pueri longis rationibus assem  
Discunt in partes centum deducere”—

still less do we venerate the wasted hours and inapplicable Latin of our grammar establishments. We look for education, and not schooling; and when we speak of blessings and regeneration, we speak of the blessings, not of schooling, but, of education.

To judge then effectively and impartially of the two results of education, it will not suffice, with a Tory magazine, to sum up scholars; nor to confound, with a gaol chaplain, absence of principle with the existence of education. We must take the thing itself, and see how and on whom it works. This cannot be done in mass, because it is not yet so diffused as to work in masses, but we can observe it in detail. If such a process produce good, and such another evil, in its own immediate circle, there is surely no reason why its extension through the whole country should not proportionately influence the whole. Let us compare an instant our old existing systems with the exceptions to those systems; what is, with what is called, education.

Manchester is supposed to be one of the best-educated towns in the empire. It deserves its fame, though Von Raumer, and still more the Report of its own Statistical Society, have very materially detracted from such honours. The old system there, as elsewhere, is strikingly illustrated by a passage in the Report. The Committee met with two instances of schools, kept by masters of some abilities, but much given to drinking, who, however, had gained such a reputation in the neighbourhood, that, after spending a week or fortnight in this pastime, they could always fill their schoolrooms again, as soon as they returned to their post. The children, during the absence of the masters, went to other schools for the week, or played in the streets, or were employed by their parents in running errands. On another occasion, one of these instructors, and guardians of the morals of our youth, was met issuing from his schoolroom, at the head of his scholars, to see a *fight* in the neighbourhood: instead of stopping to reply to any educational queries, he only uttered a breathless invitation to come along “and see the sport.” Another of these scenes of education is thus described—it contained 130 pupils, during the lessons the confusion was so great, that all queries to the schoolmaster were totally inaudible. After various attempts, with menace and entreaty, to obtain silence, “the master gave up the point, say-

ing, as he descended from the desk,—‘you see the brutes, there is no managing them.’”

The Digest of the returns of 1818 abound with instances of similar mismanagement. “Dames” are numerous, for the most part, like that sagacious old matron, noticed by Miss Hamilton, who was accustomed to read Nazareth for Nebuchodonosor; broken down soldiers, and other superannuated servants, fit, like the schoolmaster at Wallbach, for no other situation, are met with in many a page, setting up their schools for the moral and intellectual education of the rising generation.\* Professor Pillans gives a scarcely more favourable account of Scotch parish schoolmasters. They adhere, with few exceptions, to the old miseducating code. In Ireland the case was still worse. It was there oppression and ignorance combined. The Charter-school system, a system from which Protestantism was to be supplied with fresh blood,—a system which, though exposed by Howard, still blinded Wakefield, and contrived to maintain its position, under the wide wings of the Church established,—was notorious for all the cruelties, and all the follies, of which a proselytising instrument, on so large a scale, may be supposed to be composed. The atrocities committed in those schools, under the hallowed names of religion and education, are now familiar to all readers. Children made menials of by their masters, as they truly were, and not their teachers; scourged, not for the correction of moral offences, but through the caprice of drunken tyrants, to break the child into more complete

---

\* To form some judgment of these Dame schools, let the reader turn to the Manchester, Salford, Bury, and Liverpool Reports of the Manchester Statistical Society. The Salford Report says, “Four of these schools were of a superior character, containing children of a higher class than it is usual to find in them; but of the rest, two were kept in cellars, twenty very crowded, and eleven very close; some being also damp; in two schools, many of the children were asleep; about thirteen schools were very dirty, and as many disorderly, and only nineteen were found decent and orderly.” “One mistress stated, that she had expended no less than 10s. in the purchase of books, only three years ago, but that they were now lost, or so dirty and torn, as to be utterly useless. In three schools there were no books at all; in another mere remnants; in other nineteen schools, the supply was wretched, *five only, out of the whole number of sixty-five, appearing to be tolerably well provided,*” p. 7. “The generality of the teachers are wholly incompetent to the task of instruction, and their ignorance on the most common topics is lamentable.”—“Of the whole number of 1,513 children in these schools, barely one-third can be said to learn anything.” p. 8. “Yet some of these schools are superior to any of the same class in the borough of Manchester,” p. 7. And the late Report of the state of the Liverpool schools, shows the Manchester schools to be still superior to them. “As to morals, the teachers seem perfectly unconscious of their having anything to say to education; they scarcely understand the meaning of the word.”

The common, or Parochial Schools, are not much better. “One of the masters was found shutting the shutters, and turning his wife out of doors, in order to adjourn to, and establish himself in the neighbouring beer shop.” The Committee may, therefore, remark, with like justice, “that these schools are, for the most part, nearly inefficient for any purposes of real education.” p. 11.—*Salford Report.*

52 DUB  
V. 2 (H. 1 + H. 2)

bondage—money lavished, and religion, charity, and knowledge extinguished, such were some of the admired vices of these pious seminaries. The persecution has gradually dwindled away, and is now, we trust, finally got rid of, but the incompetency, in many instances, still remains behind. The Kildare Place training was a mere yeomanry drill. It got very little into the spirit of the child; it was designed to keep numbers in order, rather than to teach one well. The new Board have not yet been able to effect what they have long professed an anxiety to do—the educating an adequate number of teachers. Thus, instruction is feebly carried on, and education, in many cases, not at all. If no abundant harvest of good has followed such a system, it is assuredly a matter of no surprise. The fault lies not with the object in view, but the instruments by which it is attempted to accomplish it.

We now turn to what education really is, and what are the blessed effects of real education. The reforms worked out by Pestalozzi at Yverdon, and followed up with such signal success by De Fellenberg, at Hofwyl and Maykirch; the sudden regeneration produced at Freyburg by the Père Girard, and the complete civilisation of the inhabitants of the Ban de Roche by Oberlin,—are not more remarkable or satisfactory, than illustrations of the operation of similar systems in our own country. The wonderful change already wrought by Wilderspin in infant education, and to which the Edinburgh Report bears such ample evidence; the ameliorations brought about in the elementary and higher branches of education, in the Sessional School of Edinburgh, by Mr. Wood; the improved character of female instruction, produced by the College for young ladies, in the same capital,—are all samples of what, under proper direction, with wise views, and diligent hands, education may be made. It may now be asked, what are their results. Hear Mr. Wood.

“Of the changes which their education and *new habits* have operated upon the character of our pupils, while within the walls of the seminary, we have ourselves witnessed many very pleasing instances. Many who entered it, and that not at the very earliest stage of life, quite ignorant and regardless of religion, have there become deeply interested in its important truths, and, to all appearance at least, strongly impressed with a sense of the moral obligations which it imposes. Some who were originally addicted to lying, and to every species of meanness, and were on that account shunned by their companions, have, under the influence of the religious and moral discipline of this institution, and of that high tone of right feeling and sense of honour which it imposes, been altered into beings of apparently quite a different stamp. In nothing, however, has such an amendment been more conspicuous, than with regard to



temper. Often has it been my delight to behold sullenness and discontent converted into gratitude and satisfaction; and even to hear from the lips of the pupils themselves, acknowledgments that their parents at home have remarked a striking change upon their temper, from the period of their entering our institution."—*Wood's Account of the Edinburgh Sessional School*, p. 300.

One of the apprehensions of the anti-educationists is, that education will produce discontent, turbulence, jealousy, and strife; will disturb the gradation of the orders, indispose to patient industry, unsettle the national mind, and finally lead to revolution. What was the result of the education of Mr. Wood?

"It is quite needless to theorize upon the subject. We are daily sending out from the Sessional School multitudes of shoemakers and tailors, infected with its most dangerous poison, and are daily receiving the most gratifying assurances from their masters, of the manner in which they conduct themselves. *The industry and skill in their various occupations, is in direct proportion to their success at school*; and those who have been fortunate enough to get our best scholars, have been known to enquire whether we have any others of the like description to give them. Our greatest proficient is still content to dwell 'among their own people,' and to 'follow the occupations of their fathers.'"

They were in many instances requested "to follow the profession of teaching," but

"This request, though strongly urged, has on more than one occasion been declined by the boys themselves, who preferred entering into ordinary, mechanical occupations. Still, however, this fondness for their original studies remained. Some of them requested permission from their friends to continue at the evening school; while others, who were patterns of diligence in the workshop, employed their vacant hours at home in useful reading."—p. 308.

Such were the evils of education. But we proceed a little farther.

"On this subject, it gives us peculiar satisfaction to add, that all who have been so honoured have been not less distinguished for their attention, steadiness, ability, and zeal, in the discharge of the duties of their respective callings, which has been most satisfactorily established by very ample certificates from their masters, produced by the author, at his request."—*Idem*.

But these results, it may be thought, are to be looked for only from very favourable circumstances, acting on well-prepared physical and moral organisations. We will take another case, presenting none of these advantages, and yet exhibiting, in its effects, a still more striking evidence of the potency of good education. The Hackney-Wick School was established by the benevolent Captain Brenton about five years ago, and the Victoria

Asylum at Chiswick somewhat later, for the reform of young criminals. These are schools, as their very title intimates, not selecting from the *élite* of our population, not taking up an education already well commenced, not aided by the best of all allies, the kindly domestic affections in the pupil's own heart,—but institutions dealing only with all that is perverted, and contaminated, and abandoned in childhood; stretching out its arms to the deserted orphan, in the streets of a luxurious capital; and to the young convict, in the contagion and vices of our ill-disciplined prisons: venturing, in fact, the great experiment on the most intractable of all natures; and not merely attempting to bring into operation a good education, but to destroy, root and branch, a bad one. This, to some, may appear a generous, but hopeless project; more creditable to the benevolence than to the understanding of its founders. If effected, doubtless they must admit that it places the efficiency of education really such beyond all controversy. No opponent to education can venture to impugn a system which out of death could thus draw life, and thus clothe corruption with incorruptibility. No sceptic can continue to doubt the all-powerful effects of such an instrument on a yet unstained population, if upon sin and crime, upon the worst of habits ingrained into the very nature of the being, it works such sudden and entire revolution. But we again repeat, few will believe in such an efficacy. To such, we have only one answer to give: “come and see.” The system has been tried for the long period of five years, and has thoroughly and perfectly succeeded. To judge, however, more accurately of this success, we must contrast for a moment the child before and after education.

The description of children received in the Hackney-Wick and Victoria Asylums are thus classed, in a highly interesting little account of the methods and progress of these institutions.\*

“*First class*, boys of respectable parents, who are reduced in circumstances, and orphans of ditto. *Second class*, boys neglected and deserted by their parents, who have gained a living in the streets. *Third class*, boys from workhouses, who possessing an unsettled or enterprising spirit, have volunteered to emigrate. *Fourth class*, boys from the Houses of Correction, who, upon shewing signs of penitence, have excited the sympathy of some persons, and these have exerted them-

---

\* *Practical Remarks upon the Education of the Working Classes, with an Account of the plan pursued, &c. &c. at the Brenton Asylum, Hackney-Wick, 1835*, by Charles Forss, agricultural teacher and second master of that institution. Charles Forss, as the preface states, was educated as a simple agriculturalist and carpenter in Dorsetshire, and left his native county for the purpose only of undertaking the situation he at present holds at Hackney-Wick.

selves to get them admitted into our Asylum, on the expiration of their imprisonment."

Each of these classes present peculiar difficulties, illustrative of similar obstacles, (but at their very highest degree,) in the great masses of the community. Each have yielded to the "true education" system of the institution. After observing, that whilst the industrious in the first class are easily managed, the writer continues :

"Those who have been bred up in idleness and extravagance, and who have their heads filled with notions that were never likely to be realised, are the most useless animals in existence. They are dissatisfied with the accommodations, and always hankering after sweetmeats, fruits, &c. &c. Work is at first out of the question with them; *they cannot think of disgracing themselves by digging. Some are so idle, that they will not even wash themselves.* Now it takes some time before a boy of this description can be brought to believe, that the only way to be happy is to be industrious; but I rejoice in being able to say, that in many instances reformation has been produced, and *boys seemingly hopeless on their admission, have left us with a good character, and are going on well in the situations that have been provided for them.*"—*Id.* p. 25.

"The second class boys have claimed my particular observation; in nine cases out of ten, they are active, intelligent, and useful, if young; but when of the age of sixteen or seventeen, I find them so *confirmed in cunning and bad habits*, that it is difficult to be of any use to them: yet were I to take boys from the Asylum into my own service, I should give the preference to the younger boys of this second class, before those of the other three classes; for although care and labour are required to train them, yet they possess a quick sense of kindness, with an activity that amply repays any trouble taken with them."

("N.B. The Matron of the female school has given the same opinion, even as respects *girls*."—*Editors*.) p. 26.

"Third class, or those from workhouses. Of this class I scarcely know how to give an opinion; but from what I have observed, I am led to conclude that the character of a boy chiefly depends on the *mode of management* pursued in the particular house from which he comes. In some workhouses, there is a class of paupers who have been hanging about them for two or three generations, and who are *so entirely void of any sense of independence, that to be idle is the height of their ambition.* The boys having access and intercourse with adults of this description, is a serious evil; where this is allowed, I find them tutored in every description of *cunning and deceit, dishonesty, lying, and idleness.* In those workhouses where the boys are allowed no access to adults, *their character is better.* The boys from the former are quite *broken-spirited*, and so much *hardened by beating*, than *nothing but coercion* seems to make any impression upon them. From the latter they possess an open countenance, and they are more cheerful and obedient."—p. 27.

It may easily be imagined that the fourth class presents the greatest impediments. They are indeed serious.\*

"The boys in the fourth class are generally gone too far in crime, to be reformed very rapidly. The *connexions they have made during the time of imprisonment have so contaminated their minds, that their countenances alone betray them to a practised observer. Their propensity to cheating, thieving, gambling, and all dishonest practices, exceeds belief*; yet the only hope of reforming them is by *kind treatment, good examples, and keeping them out of the way of temptation.*"—p. 28.

But now for the results. Whatever the Manchester schoolmaster might expect—"these brutes have been managed."

"The lasting influence of our discipline is apparent in the character of those who have been provided with situations, all of whom, (six hundred have passed through the Asylums) with very few exceptions, are doing well, and give satisfaction to their employers; indeed, the success of this institution has far exceeded my most sanguine expectations."—p. 15.

This will appear still more striking, on descending to particulars. We take, with reference to the girls, the evidence of Mrs. Rebecca Boushill, head of the Asylum at Chiswick, before the Select Committee on Gaols, in the House of Lords.

Q. "Are any of them children who have been brought up ill, and engaged in criminal habits?"

A. "Yes; the majority are of that description."

\* To appreciate fully the obstacles interposed to reform by prison "discipline," as it is termed, we ought to know what it is. The late Reports of the Inspectors offer abundant materials. They represent the majority of our gaols as schools of every vice; and there are few who enter them at an early age, but are recommitted. In the Westminster Bridewell, it appears that of 215 boys of sixteen years of age and under, committed to that prison, between Midsummer and Christmas, 1834, not less than 62 were *recommitted*; of whom 31 had been once before, 7 twice, 12 three times, and 22 repeatedly in imprisonment. Of 174 committed to Bridewell Hospital, 100 had been in before; of 511 boys to Clerkenwell, in 1833, 302 before, &c. The cause of this lies in the state of the prisons. All classes of crime are mixed together. Cards, obscene books, dice, replace the Bible; gaming of all kinds, especially the lowest, employ their idle hours. There is a school; but the schoolmaster is a convict, and with the mind of one. Prostitutes frequent the cells, under the name of sisters: the utmost licence in language and manners prevails.

Before trial, the prisoners are taken to the bail-dock; sometimes as many as sixty or seventy together. There, for hours and days together, they are mixed up with the most horrid characters, like wild beasts in a den. They conduct themselves "as if they were going rather to a fair than a trial." After locking up, "there would be some," say the prisoners themselves, "gambling at one end of the tables; others would be sitting around the fire, singing, and smoking, and talking all kinds of beastly talk, and of their crimes," &c. If there be a few quiet ones amongst them, the others are all down upon them; and if they complain to the Governor or Turnkey, "they are afraid of their lives at night, after locking up."

From such sinks of iniquity came many of the pupils mentioned in the text; against such education had the education of Hackney-Wick to contend. Yet the men who rail against education, praise gaols!

Q. "Do you think that your system reforms them?"

A. "Yeg; we had one girl from St. Saviour's workhouse, who was *very vicious*; she *bit a piece out of one of her companion's shoulders, just after she came*; she was then a *very bad girl, a thief, and much given to falsehood*. She turned out so *particularly well*, that I petitioned the Ladies' Committee to leave her longer, *as an example to the others*; but it was thought advisable to send her to the Cape. She was with us *seven months*."

Q. "Do you ever take them from the gaols, after they have undergone their sentences?"

A. "We are always ready to receive such; but it is difficult to say how many we have had, because the fact is not willingly mentioned by them. We have now four from Tothill Fields under those circumstances, who all give promise of doing well."

The evidence of Mr. Charles Forss, whose report we have already quoted, is not less striking.

Q. "Have you any boys now under your charge, that have been in prison?"

A. "We have several."

Q. "Can you state the offences which they had committed?"

A. "I do not know their offences; two, who had been sent by the Lord Mayor from the Mansion House, had been in prison before."

Q. "Have you reformed any of those that have been sent to you from the prisons?"

A. "Yes, several; we have had several who have been in Newgate, and some in Brixton House of Correction. They have gone out with good characters."

The history of some of these children is highly illustrative.

"James Mayo" (we still quote Mr. Charles Forss) "was admitted to the Asylum the first week in January, 1834. He had been wandering about the streets of London for six months before; he stated himself to be sixteen years of age."

He was at first very refractory, refused to work at the order of the master. He was placed in solitary confinement. After four hours, he begged to be liberated.

"I took him out, and spoke to him in a manner that appeared to make some impression. The next day he went cheerfully to his work, and upon one of the boys shewing some inclination to disobedience, I overheard him advise him to mind what he was about, as it would not do to be stubborn here. From that moment, Mayo was industrious, civil, and obedient; so much so, that on the 23rd he was appointed general monitor, and continued in that situation up to the 14th of March, when he embarked for Cape Town, with twenty boys under his care. His general character was firm and determined, with a strong sense of justice; and I believe he left the Asylum with deep feelings of gratitude, at the age of seventeen."—p. 46.

The late reports are still more strongly confirmatory of these thorough reforms. Amongst the many instances quoted, three or four may be selected.

“John Ellis, aged fifteen, the son of indulgent parents, had been very bad, and in prison. On his first entering the Asylum, he robbed the matron of several articles. As he continued, he greatly improved. He is now at the Cape of Good Hope, and doing extremely well.”

“Benjamin Welling, aged fourteen, had been in prison several times; his character very bad,—behaved ill on entering. Greatly improved; at last, conducted himself in the most satisfactory manner. Is now at the Cape, an excellent member of society.

“Thomas Honor, aged fifteen, several times in prison; of an exceedingly bad character,—conducted himself ill on entering. Rapidly improved; and is now at the Cape, apprenticed out with every prospect of success.”

Hundreds of similar instances might be given, but these are sufficient to shew the operation of the system on the worst subjects and under the worst circumstances. To many, such effects will appear little less than miraculous. But there is no miracle in the case; they flow naturally from the cause. They are the obvious and inevitable results of *true education*.

Manual labour and moral training, are the two great principles. They give an impulse to industrious habits, which is not easily given without them. “I have known,” says Mr. Forss, “instances of boys that have been six or seven years at certain schools, and have come out of them every thing that was bad, who, after the short space of six months passed in our asylum, have gone abroad with a good character, and have proved a credit both to themselves and their masters.” They read, write, spell, as in other schools; but work, either in the field or within doors, is their great instruction. In turns each boy performs the different offices incidental to the establishment, such as cook, mate, porter, errandboy, &c. Each day is opened and closed by prayer and religious instruction. “In this institution, the boys,” says Mr. Forss, “are taught to do every thing themselves, with the strictest economy; they grow their own vegetables, cook their own food, wash and mend their own clothes, and do in fact all the work that is required on the premises—bricklaying, plastering, carpenter’s work, &c. &c. The master often tells them they must try to better their condition by industry, and make themselves useful to society by employing their time in honest labour, that they must never tell a falsehood, or use bad words. The good result is far beyond what could have been expected: although fresh boys are continually admitted, yet it is very rare to hear of a bad word being used. If a poor neglected boy should

so forget himself, his companions will instantly report him to the master."—p. 23.

They are not, however, deprived of intellectual advantages. There is daily practice, besides the studies above noticed, in mental arithmetic, and several weekly lectures in the outlines of geography, geometry, astronomy, and on agriculture, manufactures, &c. &c. They have, also, a very well-selected school library.

The girls' school is managed in a similar manner. We extract from Mrs. Boushill's evidence:—

"The principal objects of the society are to reform criminal children; to educate and train them, when neglected and destitute, in the principles of religion and morality, and to make them good domestic servants. For this last purpose their work is changed each week. We appoint the whole of them to different employments every Monday morning; we put two into the largest bed-room, two into the second, and so on. Those girls who are chambermaids this week, we make kitchen maids the next week; the next week we put them into the laundry, and afterwards they will go to the dairy; so that they have an opportunity of learning the different branches of domestic work. A great part of the morning is employed in domestic affairs, and all are in school in the afternoon, except those detained in the work of the house. We have fifty-five in the asylum just now, and have but one servant. The children make clothes for themselves, and wash for themselves," &c. &c.

It may be imagined that to obtain this admirable and useful discipline, amongst children originally so perverted, the strongest coercive means are requisite. Quite the contrary. The only instruments are kindness, patience, attention, and order, but they are all-powerful:—

"I think every one who knows how our boys are managed," says Mr. Forss, "will say that they *have not seen better discipline in any of the schools on the old thrashing system*, yet I can conscientiously say, *I have not known a single instance in our school of a boy receiving a blow from his masters*. In extreme cases of wilful error, solitary confinement for a few hours has been the most severe punishment resorted to, and it has hardly ever failed of success. When a boy does wrong, if the fault is observed by or known to the master, he takes him privately aside, and reprovcs and admonishes, as the case requires. If the fault be committed publicly, then he is publicly exposed in presence of all the boys, but they are forbid to mention his fault to him afterwards, and it is quite rare for one boy to taunt another with his offence. When a boy is put in solitary confinement, he is frequently visited by the master, who tells him he is placed alone that he may have an opportunity of reflecting on his past conduct, and as soon as he shews the smallest sign of contrition, he is kindly advised and liberated; to keep him longer would only serve to harden him."—p. 14.

The same discipline is applied to the girls' school:—

"I am quite confident," says Mrs. Boushill, "that the mode of discipline the ladies have adopted, is the best for softening the heart, and doing good to the children;—we have no punishment but solitary confinement for short periods, and lessening of food. The frequent visits and admonitions of the ladies have an excellent effect."—*Evidence, &c.*

To this may be added, the children are classed according to their moral character, and not according to their acquirements; they are under the constant inspection of their monitors and teachers; the teachers are well chosen, and well disciplined themselves; and the religious precept, communicated without violence, but with attention, and in a manner adapted to the understanding of the pupil, is enforced less by phrases than by example.

It is surely needless to add another word. Here is education, here are its results. Here is bodily suppleness and vigour, here is intelligence, here is virtue, hand in hand. Labour and reflection, habits as well as lessons, a thorough conviction on the part of the pupils, that they are objects of solicitude and affection to all around them; new circumstances, new ideas, and new characters, a wholesome public opinion operating in the school itself—this is the magic which out of this mass of contagion restores once more to its purity and energy the young spirit, and performs the most beautiful of all wonders, renovates the heart and head, and creates, in some measure, over again a human soul. But if one school produces such consequences, and in such a capital as London, why not, we ask in all humility, should not a second school produce the same; if two, why not three, why not twenty, why not hundreds, why not the country? No circumstances more antagonist than these, can in any instance be found, no success more certain and satisfactory. Would the most violent opponent to education regret to see such reform widely and deeply spread amongst our manufacturing and agricultural populations? Why then contend against the instrument by which such reforms are to be effected? Why desire a consequence, and oppose the cause? Why wish for popular virtue, and still stand up against popular education?

The fact is, the opposition of the anti-educationist is an opposition to he knows not what. If it be directed against education, we shew him what education is capable of effecting; if it be directed against bad education, he ought with us to attack the bad, but, not stopping there, endeavour also to procure the better. Were the Hackney-Wick and Victoria Asylum systems general throughout the land, he surely could not imagine that our criminal returns would give the same data which they now give.



If he desire it, what should be his course,—should he resist or encourage such education?

We do not deny, that the greater portion of our schools are of a far different description, but we cannot discover any reason why they should continue so. The great vices of our existing system are manifest—we trust also they are not invincible. We do not begin sufficiently early—what we teach is generally useless—if we teach, we do not teach long enough. We have abundance of mis-education, and our education is too short as well as too slight. The child is not taken up in time; it is not the child of nature or of God that we have to deal with, but the child of man. On the plea that the infant mind is not susceptible of education, we allow the infant to mis-educate itself. We take it soiled and profaned, rather than in the original brightness of its angelic nature. We prefer to work a miracle, rather than to follow out the work of God. We consider children, as if they were always to continue children; but those same children whom we so triflingly treat, form the materials of the future state. Out of those groups of prattlers are yet to come forth constitutions, perhaps revolutions; in all cases the destinies of yet unborn millions of men. We complain of the tendency of the present age to innovation, we look upon the entire species as in a state of constant hunger and thirst after anarchy. If this be the public will, we doubt not it will easily find the opportunity and power to gratify it. The only sure course is to alter that which may guide the will. The will of man is not sufficiently educated at present. It is the result of ideas, thoughts, passions, fixed into habits—these habits we neglect to fix. We send the child into action with no will, or a bad will; we do not create in him a strong will, and a just will. It is an absurd complaint that with such a lever we can raise nothing. It is an unjust complaint against the creature we have mis-fashioned, and against the education which we did not use. If there be disturbance in the social machine, it is because we knew not how before it was put together to shape our machinery. We carry no forethought, we see no future; we dwell within “the body of this death” of present things. No wonder that vice should be born from such teaching—that ignorance, and not knowledge, should follow.

Another cause of the inefficiency of our education, is, with few exceptions, its inapplicability. We have seen how amply this defect has been remedied at Hackney-Wick; nothing is there done but with a reference to the future position of the pupil. Not so with us. The majority of our systems are absolutely aimless: take them at what grade we may, our schools spend their energies on objects of quite secondary importance to the pupil,

while they omit principals. We look to the Universities for our future statesmen. How much of state knowledge, in the shape of the moral or political sciences, is communicated there? Is history, are the laws of our own or other countries, is social economy, is constitutional instruction, the great components of their course? The classics and the mathematics divide the empire of the young student's mind; they send him into the world informed but not educated, fitted only for one state, and a state, too, which is rapidly passing away. There was a time when a sermon would not be listened to unless slashed and furbelowed with Latin quotations, which no one understood. A flock would not move for any one less than a "Latiner." The Houses of our Legislature exacted a similar tribute. A tag of classicality was the Shibboleth of the "set." In no other form could a rising young man make his first debutant bow to the public, than in a verse from Horace or Virgil. The country gentlemen revered afar off, and listened to avoid scandal. But these fooleries are dying. Men have the pressure of stirring times, and an earnest and intelligent population about them; they must look to something more real than these puerile elegancies. A new measurer of trochaics and anapæsts is not precisely the man to reset the disjointed state. Not that we at all undervalue classical studies,—far from it; we venerate them, we cherish them. We agree with Schwartz, that, next to the Scriptures, the study of the great models of Greek antiquity is of all others the most calculated to raise and ennoble the mind. We believe that its lessons pass from the memory into the understanding, and from thence into the character and conduct of man; we believe that, rightly worshipped, in no narrow and pitiful scholastic sense, it will raise us into something of that "ideal" which was the aspiration of the great of all times, and which cannot be too much encouraged as a defence against the Mammonite philosophy of the present. But this is a study not to be taught from a "Gradus ad Parnassum,"—it is a spirit not vouchsafed with a Bachelorship of Arts. It is not with Latin or Greek it will stop. It will fly for congenial food to the great spirits of our own tongue. It will read the ancients in the moderns. Bacon, and Milton, and Locke, and Taylor, and Hooker, these will also be its classics, out of such study of Greek and Latin will also grow an English mind. But is this the character, the tendency of our actual classical instruction? Is it not content with the husks of learning? does it not glory in the masks and manacles of words? How few who do not admire the frame rather than the picture, and adore the veil instead of the sanctuary. •Even as linguists they are poor; for ever on a treadmill they never advance. Our best commentators are

German, our best Latin writers have studied abroad. Is it worth spending the best hours of life to do such trifles so extremely ill? Such men are not educated to raise the mind or character of any nation. In the world, as in the college, they live a life of shadows and phrases. We want legislation, and not pedantry: rulers, and not academicians.

The existence of our middle classes is essentially practical.—“real”—as the Germans would term it; so also ought to be their education. It is anything but that. If low, it ends with reading, writing, and cyphering, and keeping accounts; that is with the key, but nothing else. If high, it is a grammar school,—latin, and latin, and nothing more. But a head manufacturer may not read twenty words of that language all his life, it lies in his mind as lumber; it not only fills but oppresses; he spends time and labour, and he gets half knowledge, or no knowledge, or the knowledge which he does not want; what he does want he cannot get. He has to deal with all sorts of results, chemical, mechanical, mineralogical,—what does he know of any one of them? His trade to him is art-magic, or mere mechanical routine; he blunders often, to be sure, on the right, and calls it good luck. But there is no good luck for the instructed; he sees, as it were, in the distance his discovery, and goes on to it by slow but certain steps. He does not bring out of his situation or means half what they might produce; the least degree of appropriate education would have doubled his power; but where are we to look for it? in this commercial nation, where are we to seek for a truly commercial school?

Our lower classes are if possible worse off.—Schools of Industry, Hackney-Wicks, there doubtless are—but how easily can they be counted! It is the education of this or that society, not of the nation. The lower classes for the most part are born labourers, and are likely to die labourers: a noble destiny—a most bountiful dispensation, if they were only taught to think that it was such. It is the using of one’s being—the ennobling consciousness that we have power—that we have faculties and limbs, and can make them produce—that we can strive and can succeed. No man is exempted from labour, of one kind or other, or if he be, he is to be pitied,—he is doomed to a curse. But are these the maxims upon which our popular education is founded? Are these the lessons not preached, but infused? Does the child enjoy, or turn to true value, either labour or relaxation? Is he taught equally to venerate the alphabet, and the plough? Is the soil and his own mind placed side by side, as the source of all manly pleasures and fortunes? Does he know on leaving the school how to cultivate either? Is he taught to raise his physical existence beyond the

scale of his forefathers, to fill up its intervals by mental enjoyments? Is he taught the duties of his state? with general ideas of vice and virtue, has he any idea of the peculiar complexion of the vices and virtues of his situation? He regards the tillage of the land as a penalty, and reading and writing, as an instrument only which may enable him some day to escape from it. In the interval he is an indolent labourer, and a discontented man. Do not say that in this case, his intellect has been overcultivated at the expense of the body—no such thing. Both have been allowed to lie fallow. Intellect is better exercised on things than words; a boy who has got the habit of observation, precise ideas upon what he sees and hears, who knows how to bring his stock into use whenever required, is a far better cultivator of his intellect than the glibest reader and writer in the world; leave him his reading and writing, and nothing else, and you will only make him a secretary for Captain Rock. We confess our ideas of an educated peasantry are very different: they are those of Hackney-Wick: we should like to see their “learning” in their manner of turning up the soil and boiling a pot, their “virtues” in the Christian peace, and honesty of a comfortable cottage home. No wonder that the opposite course should have jostled the classes against each other, no wonder there should be vanity, and discontent, and disorder. Instead of simply but substantially clothing him, we send him our cast-off frippery, and set him up to be stared at by his fellows. The labourer wants education but in the sense of the labourer; he wants a coin that will pass; teach him to love his situation by making it a situation to be loved, and you will not require bayonets to force or keep him down. It is not the Coercive Statute nor the Poor Law, which is order, but every man in his right place, and every man endeavouring to make it so. This is not half so difficult as what we are so obstinately pursuing at present: we are acting in complete contradiction to circumstances and the human mind.

A third defect in our present education is that it is not carried out. The Hackney-Wick Committee watch over their pupils until they are twenty; we leave them at the threshold of the school. But how few are there at this tender age proof against temptation! How many are entangled in circumstances to which their moral power is not adequate! the age at which the passions are most powerful, statistically proved, is between the age of nineteen and twenty; it is precisely at this period that society which affects to be so solicitous for its own security and the happiness of its members, ushers the youth into the wild torrent of human action without a guide or a support; for there are few who walk aloof from the roar and tumult of existence,

—“*ακειων παρὰ θίνα πολυφλοισβοιο θαλασσης.*”

or who have not in the world of their own soul, some especial Satan, to plunge them onward into fatal indulgence. This then is the time of all others for the guardian angel of Education to watch about their paths, to beckon them from the precipice, to stand between them and the enclosing enemy. Education must here, if not so directly, not less effectually, defend and conduct. All subsidiary means must be devised to keep awake the early religion of the heart; if the ordinary school be not sufficient, the reform school must come to its aid; vice must not be allowed to become crime; it must be met and extinguished in the bud. Libraries, and Societies, and moral and agreeable relaxations, must be everywhere ready to receive the well-disposed. If education is to begin at the cradle, it should end only at the grave; every form and stage of our existence should be considered a portion of its great course.

The prevalence of these defects constitute miseducation, and it is from miseducation, and not education, that all the evils complained of by the anti-educationist, necessarily and actually flow; yet from a want of due reflection on these facts, there are few of the "social order" men who do not raise the cry indiscriminately against both. Every age has its bugbear, and preachers to make it as appalling as possible,—this, of "too much education," and "too rapid education," is ours. Dr. Bell had to apologise for teaching reading, and for awhile excluded, by way of compensation, all writing from his school; it was thought to dispose to forgery; but the forgeries apprehended did not follow, and Dr. Bell became a convert, and converted others, to writing. We confess we see no difference between this and the present outcry about teaching a few steps higher—giving glimpses, as it is scoffingly termed, of geography, geometry, singing, drawing, to clowns! "Whereas before our fathers had no other books but the score, and the tally, thou hast caused printing to be used, contrary to the King, his crown, and dignity; it will be proved to thy face, that thou hast men about thee that usually talk of a noun and a verb, and such abominable words that no christian ear can endure."—All this is relative: the luxuries of one age are the necessaries of another; these men ought to go out into the highways, and cry down the too great celerity in the transmission of the post, the perilous innovation of rail-roads and steamers.—Oh! for the glorious days of Darby-Dillys and ten day journeys to London! What a horror, that men can now go to Paris for 13s. per head! Telegraphs, and hydro-oxygen light-houses would doubtless have been witchcraft, and punishable, to our fore-fathers.—When first a gas-light was erected in Pall Mall, the "too rapid illuminators" who invented it were indicted for a

nuisance. Many there are who still repine in their heart of hearts at the "Education nuisance," but we cannot therefore consent to take up with their blinking oil lights, though it might prove a better job for this or that churchwarden of the parish. In this anti-education section, all however is not mere candid fear or folly; every inch that is not fool is knave—there is a lurking idea, not that men may not see well enough, but that they may see too well;—abuses may be discovered rather too early and too clearly for the convenience of those who fatten on them. This however, even for the monopolist, is a narrow view of the subject; the advantages gained by putting into action so large an amount of mind, will far outbalance to him any advantage he may have specially held, not by his elevation in the social scale, but by the numbers he held below him. The present age is divided, like every other age, between admirers of the past, and hoppers in the future; the old and young men, each in their relative positions, each with their characteristic passions and opinions; some see all perfection in the middle ages, the venerable "Mittel alter," and all degeneracy and defect in the present; others the reverse. Both to a certain point are right, and both wrong. If present times have their defects, we must not forget that actual civilization, whatever it may be, is the accumulated result of many thousand years, and that its intellectual and moral physiognomy represent not only living men, but those also who have preceded them. The "esprit de négation," a fanatical rejection of all old methods, (for there is a fanaticism in reform as well as in resistance to reform,) may be carried in some cases too far, but it is the sign of "a living spirit"—it tokens, not retrocession but advance. The very disorders which attend such developement are not new to our age; they are the very condition of the *vis motrix*: the centrifugal force which impels forward our humanity. Doubtless a centripetal force, to steady and well define principles, must also be generated, to keep us in our proper orbit, and this perhaps has not yet been found; but there is a tendency to find it, there is an anxiety, in despite of all cavil to the contrary, to seek it out. The present age is, truly speaking, not the sequel to the middle ages, but the middle age itself; it is eminently the age of transition; society is still looking on every side for the positive. They who would stop such search, not only do not understand mankind or men, but do not understand the interests of their own little selfishness, they see neither through metaphysical nor historical experience. A Conservatism which thinks to stand still whilst mankind is passing on, is a conservatism which resists, and from an enmity to revolution and anarchy, may become by such resistance both revolutionist and anarchist. There is nothing final;

in an universe all change; the moral, like the physical ocean, is not tideless; the vessel of this or that party may be anchored, but the waters on which it rides move on: its resistance serves only to mark more visibly, that if it be stationary these waters are not. If this be true, the anti-educationist who knows his own, and the public interests, has little choice. The question cannot wait—it cannot stand still—it ought not to stand still; it is then for him, even in the spirit of his own conservatism, no longer to vent his anger in idle exclamation, against *all* education, but to set himself with others in earnest to the task, to make education as *good* as he can: if he fears for the future, let him provide for it; if he be for resisting the age, let him take care that education, by distorted and diagonal movements, not in harmony with the age, does not rather enhance the evils of such resistance: it is still in his power to rule posterity; but to do so, he must rise beyond the mists of the present, he must extend himself beyond the space of his ephemeral existence. He who educates for his age only, will educate below the age upon which education should tell. He must bear in mind that a reform revolution has taken place, and thus to enlarge the limits of freedom, without at the same time enlarging the limits of knowledge, is working in an inverse ratio for all public happiness. The people require now, if ever, to be trained to the wisdom of using their franchises well; they must be educated up to the level of their new constitution, they are now called on to act—they must be taught, therefore, to see and think. The anti-educationist cannot repeal the new charter, he has only to see that its working be entrusted to such minds as in good time may work it well.

Few men now go to the full length of this direct hostility to education; some have been frightened, others shamed, a few convinced, out of the absurdity. It is not less true, however, that there is still a strong though compromised feeling, moving in an under current against it. Not being able to extinguish education, many there are who are zealously engaged in neutralising it. Some have made it a monopoly, others a persecution; some have, under the title of “national,” effectively excluded a large portion of the nation; others, by making it religious *only*, have injured the efficiency and profaned the sanctity of religion itself. Into the motives and movements of this class of anti-educationists, we do not now propose to go; but on some future opportunity we shall be enabled, we trust, to show that they have been still *more* injurious to the progress of education than the less insidious, but more blundering and open antagonist himself. These too must sooner or later melt, like their predecessors, into the ranks of the country. In an age which witnessed the passing of the

Slave Trade Extinction Bill, the Catholic Relief Bill, the Parliamentary Reform Bill, ignorant indeed and craven, must he be, who, in such a cause as Education Reform, can despair.

Another class,—we know not whether to call them friends or foes to education,—are the Indifferents, the Apathetics. They are not to be taken in by any such quackery—they are for a solid beef and pudding organisation of society: they regard physical and intellectual enjoyments not only as distinct, but as opposed. Hence, the moment you talk of instruction they instantly turn you round on bread. “Give poor-laws first, and then we will consent to think of schools.” We say, give both, and both at once, or rather give no poor laws, unless you are quite sure you can give education too. So far from giving a stone instead of a loaf, it gives, by the skill to produce them, two loaves instead of one. These philosophers are the political materialists of society, they believe in nothing—but what they can touch with flesh and bone. Beyond the mere brute man, the mechanical dealing and paying machine, they know little of man or men around them. No effort, in their minds, is worth any thing, which cannot in the instant be coined into pounds, shillings and pence. These men when pressed for their co-operation in furthering education, profess the love but doubt of the possibility of advancing the people; and in order to prove their apprehensions true, take care by a refusal of all assistance to make them so. Projects with them, however feasible, if they extend beyond an hour are “phantasms:” if they go into details which they have not read or reflected enough to understand, “crotchets:” if persevered in, “hobbies” and “bores.”—It is in vain to point out to them that there has never been any great measure, involving large and important changes, which has not successively been all three. But all this is ignorance disguised by vanity,—selfishness opposing usefulness under the respectable pretext of experience and sagacity. They are by half the world called “the friends of education,” and they submit to the honour without a word. If doing nothing *for*, and not a little *against*, education, be friendship, they deserve it. But appeal to them too frequently, or rouse them too abruptly, and to get rid of the importunity—they become at once its avowed enemies. They are in general, however, more quiescent. In this state they form the sand bag, the great dead weight—the *vis inertie*, against which the cause of education, even more than against direct hostility, has still to strive. Of such is a large portion of the country, and some eight or nine-tenths, we regret to say, of our legislature and government.

These men, as we have said, are the dubious, and seem like bats between either army; but there are others—“friends of



education" as they insist upon being called—who are scarcely less its foes. We do not speak of the wild and impracticable enthusiast, who sees existing things only as visions, and clothes unrealities with flesh and bone—we do not attack the empiricist, who drunk with his own local success, has the vanity to expect his experiment will be enshrined in the statutes of a nation—still less do we mean to call to trial the open adventurer, who trades with the effrontery of any other market jobber, on the intellects and morals of the rising generation. These are cases too notorious, and too easy to be mistaken, to merit a moment's reflection. The pseudo-support and hollow protection to which we would direct attention, is less noticed and more pernicious. The "friends of education," the "true educationists," of whom we speak, are the powerless men in power, the "can't be done" men, who make an outcry about the outcries of others, in order to avoid the necessity of doing any thing themselves. Let them get noise and tumult enough to divert the public attention, and they seize with earnestness the happy opportunity to fall asleep. "The people do not ask—the country is not ripe"—but they take especial care that no unnecessary hints shall be conveyed to the people—and that the country shall be kept as far as possible from the sun. Not that they oppose—oh no! nothing can be farther from their thoughts—they only want a little time for consideration, a little interval of repose—"Yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep."—*Prov.* xxiv. Parliamentary discussions there are none, for the Opposition sit mute, and let the subject pass through—they make way for it between their ranks, that it may run itself down. If such a grievance as a debate be probable, there is an easy mode of getting rid of it, (an important expedient in parliamentary strategies). The House is counted out by an impromptu secession, on some appointed day and hour, and the orator is extinguished with the House. Should the Minister at last, by some unhappy blunder on his side, be driven into an observation upon the subject, he takes care to make it answer the safe purposes of silence, or indulges in some complacent panegyric on the exertions of government, with an Exchequer feeling for pounds, shillings and pence. The school-houses are filled with legs and arms!—the Voluntary system works so well! why should we disturb the progress of good by overdoing it?—what can the nation want more? These truisms, as they are considered in the House of Commons, are replied to on the Opposition side by a thorough assent so far as inaction and penury are recommended, but when the debate comes to the question of teaching, they insist on some millions of Bibles more! In all this—education on both sides is left out. The "practical men" have

omitted the most practical and essential part of the whole;—they have required teaching, and not yet produced teachers—they have mistaken the mere mechanism of education for its spirit and soul. To talk to such men of any thing, “general,” is an absolute waste of time. John Bull, time out of mind, has been their servant and victim,—time out of mind the “practical men,” the “tape-tiers,” have been the dispensers of his conscience and purse. Admirable work have they made of it, if we are to take the Statute Book with all its incoherences and oversights as a proof. Urge these men, the mighty movers of great events by little means, who would consider themselves lost, if they moved out of their pin-making department in Parliament, to set boldly about a broad and effective system of National Education, and they shrink in dismay. They will plant for you a little school, with a little master, in a snug little village; but the moment you ask for education for a Country, you speak madness, their “micromegas” faculties cannot rise so high; they are, by their very nature, opposed to construction and system. They love to see legislation picturesque, and take care that no one law, man, or duty, shall in any way answer or set up for the brother of another. It is to be hoped that we shall some time or other emerge from this Lilliputian knick-knackery of legislation, into something larger and worthier of men holding the destinies of a great people in their hands. What a system on a national scale may produce, even with all its defects, has been proved sufficiently in Ireland to give a little courage. It is not with 10,000*l.* for a Normal school or two, nor with 20,000*l.* thrown out as a bone of contention between rival systems, that much “national” good can possibly be expected—that we can reform the education of a nation. We have spent millions upon our wars, we actually are spending in Spain not less this year than half a million sterling; our bayonets in Ireland cost us thousands; 20,000,000*l.* entailing a debt of 800,000*l.* a year, has been given to the slave proprietors in the West Indies, for a great moral object—nay, a palace of our king’s has cost 800,000*l.*, and we traffic and haggle when education is in question, for a few thousands. But money is not enough; with thousands no more than with hundreds, if we have nothing else, can we build up the mind of a nation. Mind must be treated by mind, and to carry this treatment generally and effectively, into operation, it must be done on system. *Κεκριμένα μη κινείν* is no maxim to be adopted where there is on every side around us abuse or deficiency. We must have a “National System,” by which every man in the country, and his children after him, shall be secured, not the husks on which

men have hitherto been feeding, but a substantial, applicable, enduring education,—physical, intellectual and religious. Well does Herder, complaining of these defects even in his day and country, exclaim—

“What is the meaning of the word *learning*? We have upon this subject the most erroneous ideas, if we believe that it means to fix in our memory strange words? Words are sounds—unaccompanied with thought, we learn like parrots. Words without thought are to the human soul a pernicious opium, which at first plunges us into a sweet dream, but from which follow all the evil consequences of such a dream of mere words, (*Wortraume*). They deaden the soul, they keep it firmly locked in inactivity; it falls away and dwells in a slumber of injurious thought,” &c.

And such has been in great measure the result of our Voluntary system of education and of our leaving educationists wholly to themselves. It is surely time for us to try something else: we have to rescue infancy from corruption, to render youth fit for the duties of men, to see that age does not forget the intellectual vigour and acquirement, the Christian precept and habit of youth.\* We know not how this on a sufficiently large and permanent plan can be attained, but by a wise, liberal, and general system for the three countries, of National Education. The example of all countries (for England is now the only state without one), ought surely to be provocation and encouragement enough. If it be an object desirable to a nation, it can only be effected by the legislature and government; the legislature and government, for the sake of the nation, ought not to let another session pass without attempting it. In this they not only discharge a duty, but lay the foundation of the surest prosperity and highest fame. We think with Schwartz—

“The other relation, in which the state is bound to take due care of the rising youth, depends immediately upon the duty which she owes to herself, inasmuch as she falls or rises in proportion to the education of the new generation. If youth goes astray, the whole of the people gradually fall away from all attachment to the state, the bonds of law are loosened, disorder ensues, and at last breaks out into the condition of savage life. The better youth is brought up, the deeper-rooted is all citizenship and society, the richer with hope and blessing flourishes the entire state. Hence, the instruction of youth is as much an obligation imposed upon the State, as his own education upon each individual; and hence, also, is it that she can never sufficiently establish and secure her own welfare, unless she educates well for the present and the coming age, her own children (*Landeskinder*). The state is the more imperatively bound to this solicitude, inasmuch as she stands in the place of the community, or rather of all mankind, and is placed there by God to advance the order and improvement of humanity; and while

she discharges a debt towards her own, to those children especially hers, she at the same time performs a duty of love (*Liebesflucht*) towards other nations, for the improved culture of the one travels to the other whenever it may be wanted, and thus she becomes a light which throws its illumination on every side around. Such is the natural position of a state which provides by wise laws for the education of her youth: she fulfils a sacred duty both towards herself and towards her species. Hence advance, proportionally with their solicitude for education, the fame and glory of such countries, both with the present and with all coming generations."—*Die Schulen*, p. 133.

---

ART. II.—1. *The Catholic Church, Five Sermons preached in the Parish Church of Blackburne, on occasion of the commemoration of the Reformation, celebrated October 4th, 1835.* By the Rev. J. Whittaker, D. D.

2. *The Duty of contending for the Faith; A Sermon preached in the Church of St. John, Swansea, on Sunday, October 4th, 1835.* By the Rev. Henry Roxby Maude, LL.B.

3. *The Prevalence of Popery considered; A Sermon preached in Mount Zion Chapel, Tunbridge Wells, on Lord's Day, October 4th, 1835.* By B. Slight.

(C. 11.) we for a moment conceive the times and seasons of God's appointment, leaving the axes of their unerring revolutions, to interfere in each other's functions; or rather, to descend from a sphere so high above our theme,—could we imagine such a tribunal as Lucian has devised for the letters of the alphabet, before which any day of the year might sue its neighbour for trespassing on its appropriated functions,—we are right sure that the fifth day of moody November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-five, would apply for a solemn writ against the fourth day of the preceding month, as having unjustifiably usurped its duties in the calendar of bigotry. It is true, that, for some years, thanks to the good sense and feeling of our fellow-countrymen, the bonfires of that day had waxed pale and faint; Guy Fawkes, with his lantern, had been plucked by the police, as a nuisance, out of the hands of city urchins; the bells in many places had refused to peal their tones of gratitude, and even the indulgence of immunity from lesson and birch had been, in many schools, withdrawn, for the commemoration of the festival. These were bad symptoms; and something new must be done. Consultation was held, due deliberation was taken, and the sacerdotal caste decided

that one great tercentenary cycle of the Reformation was expired; that, during its course, a full degree of the zodiac had been passed over, by a retrograde movement, so that, consequently, the heliacal rising of the dog-star of fanaticism must, for the next Sothic period, be placed exactly one month and one day earlier,\* on the fourth of October. As far as we have an interest in the matter, the change is in our favour. We would rather have the grand festival of Protestantism celebrated as a commemoration of its own principle, by the observance of the day on which its palladium or *ancile*—a Bible without comment, in the vulgar tongue—is supposed to have come down from Heaven, than see its triumphs marked by feast-days of a political character, calculated to perpetuate the evil feelings, which may have once prevailed among members of the same social body. Not that, even here, invidious comparison was intended to be eschewed; for care was taken, that the medal, which commemorated the final translation of the Bible by Myles Coverdale, on the 4th of October, should, on the reverse, exhibit Popery locking up the word of God. But still, the ground of rejoicing, now chosen, was less offensively hostile to us, in its nature, than those which had previously been selected to arouse the failing enthusiasm of Protestantism.

The calling of a general assembly to a festival of rejoicing, the proclamation of a universal jubilee, the directing of the voices of all preachers, and the prayers of all congregations, to a specific theme of thanksgiving, are offices, one should have naturally supposed, belonging to the highest authority, and requiring a power vested only in the superiors of a church. But, on this occasion, it was a matter of private responsibility. The Bishops slumbered, the Metropolitans took no part, the *Church* was silent; while others, more zealous, deemed them dumb dogs that would not bark, and undertook themselves to raise the new war-whoop of bigotry, from one extremity of the island to the other. Marvels were, indeed, expected from this new combination of the forces and energies of Protestantism. The saints had long languished for some new manifestation of the spirit; the happy millennium had been expected; the Irvings and the Fabers had prophesied its speedy approach, in the downfall of Popery;—yet Popery did not even seem to totter; the land of promise was nearly in possession, but the walls of the spiritual Jericho seemed yet proud and strong. Proclamation went out, that, on the fourth day of October, 1835, being Sabbath, all the tribes should

---

\* The great Egyptian cycle, called the Sothic period, was determined by the heliacal rising of Sirius, or the dog-star.

be gathered together in their strength, and march in solemn array about its bulwarks, bearing with them their boasted palladium; while all the priests and Levites should sound forth their hostile trumpets, and shake, from coping to foundation-stone, the olden walls that rested upon the rock. Long, and loud, and sonorous was the blast, grating at once and grateful to the ears of the zealous; and if, to the honour of our countrymen, there were many parishes where this unauthorised summons was not answered, there were not wanting those, which, in the exuberance of their pious emotion, anticipated the chosen day, and even prolonged, to succeeding Sabbaths, the sweet music of their warlike notes. Nay, not so contented, they even felt themselves called to publish their scores for the benefit of posterity, and of those less fortunate souls who heard not their strain. Of this character are the publications before us.

Let not the reader, for a moment, imagine, that we have selected them from the mass of similar effusions, as though exhibiting eloquence of a nobler order, or learning of greater research, or feelings of a higher standard, or arguments of a more formidable power. The choice, if choice it could be called, has been purely accidental. The pamphlets on our table fell in our way, we know not how, came we remember not whence; they were skimmed over in a few moments, and then cast away; nor would they have been deemed by us worthy of farther notice, had not one or two reflections, that sprung up in our minds after perusing them, appeared to us worth pursuing. In fact, they belong to the ephemera of the times; they are creatures called into existence by a day of accidental warmth, to dance upon the running waters, to flutter over the stream of events, in which they soon must meet their grave. A naturalist may catch a few, and find amusement and instruction in anatomizing them; but, when he has studied a few specimens, he finds them all alike, and too insignificant to repay the minute dissection they require.

The reflections, to which we have just alluded, are obvious and simple, and a few lines will explain them. It is determined, on a certain day, to unite all Protestants in voice and heart, for the commemoration of a certain event, vital to their religion, and containing in itself the practical verification of its essential principle. The Bible alone, accessible to every Christian, his individual right and possession, the Bible alone, without an infallible guide, without a dogmatical authority in the Church,—such is the basis of Protestantism, in contradistinction to Catholicity. Coverdale is supposed first to have rendered this principle of practical utility, by conferring on this nation a Bible which could be practically used. We waive the enquiry, whether the ground-

work of the festival be correct, that is, whether the completion of Coverdale's version can be considered the first presentation of an English version to our country: for we wish to make our present investigation an investigation into principles, and are, consequently, willing to assume the correctness of the fact. It is, therefore, proclaimed and provided, that, on a certain day, the great Protestant principle shall be solemnly commemorated throughout the land, and the sympathies of all, who acknowledge it, are ordered to be concentrated on a point equally dear to all. It is a subject as important and valuable to the Dissenter as to the Churchman, to the Evangelical as to the High-Church clergyman, to the Hierarchist as to the Congregationist. For one Sunday, at least, out of the Sabbaths of 300 years, a unity of object, a harmony of feeling, a sameness of doctrine, a union of charity, an assimilation of thought, will pervade the whole body of Protestantism, and impel it to move, by a common law, in one given direction. At least, were the superiors of our Church, domestic or general, to command the observance of a certain day, as the 18th of January, in grateful commemoration of the blessing of unity bestowed upon the Church, through the authority vested in its pastors, and chiefly in the occupier of St. Peter's chair, we are sure that the same doctrine, the same motives of thankfulness, the same instructions would be presented in every church and chapel which obeyed the call. There might be richer treats of eloquence and erudition in one than in another, but the theme and the feeling would be but one throughout.

Well, then, was it so, with the great tercentenary commemoration of the principles of Protestantism? Our materials are indeed scanty; but luckily, the fewer elements of comparison we possess, the smaller the chances of dissimilarity. If, therefore, we shall find, in a few instances, wide dissent, we may well conclude, that an extension of our objects of comparison would only still further encrease it. We will, however, draw occasionally upon other productions, in date nearly contemporary, and in purpose not dissimilar.

The first consequence, which we should naturally have expected from the character of this festival, would be an accordance in the great principles of the Reformation. But, had it been the lot of any one to hear two or more of these discourses, preached the same day, for the same object, he certainly would have been at a loss to discover, that anything more than the triumph of particular sectarian principles was intended to be commemorated. The Vicar of Blackburne, in the vivacity of his zeal, edified his congregation with five sermons on the occasion, and headed them with the pompous title of "The Catholic Church." He

stands in the pulpit, with all the solemnity of a minister belonging to a well-endowed church, to establish her claim to be the *Catholic* Church, and to thunder his withering anathemas against Popery and Papists. He minces not the matter indeed; he dilutes not, sweetens not, the bitter cup which he thrusts upon his neighbours' lips. Superstition, vice, ignorance, idolatry, infidelity—these are our qualities, these our possession; while the church-goers and rate-payers of Blackburne, 5000, we are told, in number, (p. 4) “belong to a pure, apostolic church, as nearly approaching to perfection in doctrine and government, as any that has existed since the apostolic time”! p. 45. Then, too, the reverend vicar hath great compassion on “the poor and ignorant Papist,” because he must “implicitly receive whatever his priest tells him he must believe, do, and *pay*, in order to obtain eternal life”! Why did he not conclude his sermons by the apposite prayer, which would so justly have summed up their substance and embodied their spirit:—“Lord, We give thee thanks that we are not as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers;—as also are *these Papists*”? For, while these arrogant assumptions of exclusive righteousness were thus proclaimed in the parish church, the Catholic congregation was not far distant, learning, we doubt not, from their worthy pastor, to be lowly before God, and meek and charitable towards all men.

The conception then, formed by Dr. Whittaker, of the principles and feelings, which this commemorative festival should excite, seems to be, that all acrimonious feeling against his Catholic neighbours and fellow citizens should be stirred up and renewed, that a barrier of hatred and bigotry should be drawn between members of the two religions, and that one should be held up to the other, as a “hideous mass of spiritual deformity and falsehood,” as “the patron of ignorance, vice, and infidelity.” p. 72. Gracious heavens! And is *his* Protestantism then synonymous with Christianity, with the religion of charity and love? Was the spirit of the Reformation one of hatred and antagonism, of misrepresentation and falsehood, that it should be deemed duly celebrated, by five mortal discourses, rank with a festering exuberance of these antichristian and antisocial feelings? And hath the mantle of its founders fallen from Heaven, if it could do no better than warm its inheritors into so unholy a zeal, and animate them only to scatter firebrands of religious animosity among a peaceful and friendly neighbourhood?

For the honour of human nature, we hope that no religion, aspiring to the name of Christian, will recognize, as a worthy solemnization of its principles, a display of such unchristian sentiments. But after all, this “catholic church,” the beauties and



perfections of which have charmed the Vicar of Blackburne into so zealous a hatred of Popery, whereof does it consist? The call upon men to rejoice in the translation of the Bible, was intended to unite all the tribes of Protestantism in one shout of praise; it was a motive of common joy to all, and all dissentient feelings were to merge in one universal song of gratitude. Dr. Whittaker too gives us, as a reason why the Protestant Churches should be considered the Catholic church, rather than ours, that "they prevail over a larger space of the globe, (!) and are actuated by a more catholic and liberal spirit, not refusing to recognise, as brethren in Christ, those who are not governed by the same laws."—p. 37. The "Catholic church," therefore, consists of Protestant congregations, spread more extensively over the world than the Catholics are, and recognising one another as brethren, though they have different governments. Now, we beg the reader to compare these words with the following passage:—

"Our National Church of England was foremost in asserting the common rights of Christians—among the first to throw off the subjugation of Rome. *Many (so called) Protestant Churches have apostatized from the primitive faith of Christ, and are now to be found fighting among our adversaries. But the Church of England...still exists, still remains the same as she was three centuries since, and still lifts her banner aloft to the nations.*"—p. 19.

How, we ask, were the hearers of these two passages to reconcile them together? The Protestant Churches are more extensively dispersed over the world than the Catholic, and yet *many* so called are apostates, and fight on the other side. Which are these many? Switzerland we may suppose is one, in consequence of its defection to Socinianism; Protestant France is tainted with the same error, and Germany is deeply involved in rationalism. But the learned Doctor tells us as much. After saying that "it was quite otherwise on the continent, in France, Switzerland, and Germany," than in happy England, he proceeds as follows:

"And what has been the consequence? *They are all of them, with few, I believe no exceptions, corrupted as to the essentials of Christianity.* The cankerworm of Socinianism, the dry-rot of infidelity, have eaten completely through the whole body, substance, and into the very core of these foreign churches, which at first were as pure and as scriptural as was our own in the time of Edward VI...Most of these churches, to which we have made allusion, are chargeable with direct heresy; and *are no more to be considered part of Christ's catholic church,* than we have shown the apostate Church of Rome to be."—p. 104.

Once more we ask, in the name of consistency, what and where are the Protestant churches, that prevail over a larger portion of the world than ours, if France, Switzerland, and

Germany, are as little a part of the Catholic church as we are? England and America, we must imagine, possessed of some mystical ubiquity, compose this universal church. But still more, we ask, how is Protestantism shown to be Catholic, "by a more catholic and liberal spirit, not refusing to recognise as brethren in Christ those who are not governed by the same laws," when the very teacher who gives this proof of catholicity, unsparingly cuts away from the Church immense masses of people, yea, entire nations, who glory in the name of Protestants? Is this a whit more liberal than what is imputed to us Catholics? Such, then, is the spirit with which a learned vicar thought it meet to celebrate the great commemoration of Protestant principles; venting the most unjust and unfeeling abuse against a religion, which he manifestly understands not, and then shutting out, in a series of almost irreconcilable passages, the great bulk of Protestants, who take the Bible alone for their guide, from all participation in the joy of the day, or the blessings of the Reformation.\* Hence it is plain, that, so far from the principle thus celebrated, or the motive assigned, having led Protestants to any thing like unity, or an all-embracing harmony, it has only given a ground to the High-Church divine, to utter condemnation on all Protestants of another sect or complexion. In short, the great lessons taught to the good people of Blackburne, in commemoration of the translation of the Bible, were, that Catholics were every thing wicked, that all continental Protestant churches were out of the pale of salvation, and that all Dissenters lived in the sin of schism! (p. 100.) There is a catholically liberal spirit indeed!

Well, turn we now to Tunbridge Wells, and let us hear the wholesome instructions breathed, by Mr. Slight, upon the same occasion, in Mount Sion Chapel. His discourse bears a more stirring title, "The Prevalence of Popery Considered." Think you that a statistical view of the progress and strength of our religion is here going to be unfolded? Think you that the number of our Churches, and Colleges, and Monastic houses will be stated, and the amount of our Clergy, and the zeal of our Proselytism, and the success of our efforts set before the world? Then, greatly will you be disappointed. This is not the Popery, whose prevalence Mr. Slight wishes to expose. He has no such narrow views; a few paragraphs dispatch us; we are soon put down:—"There was a Church at Jerusalem before there was

---

\* Still further must the auditors of these different passages have been bewildered, upon hearing the following sentence in the concluding discourse:—"But so far as the essentials of the Christian faith are concerned, we know that there are no differences of any moment among Protestants." p. 100.

one at Rome;" *therefore* the Pope's supremacy "carries its own refutation on the very front of it." (p. 5.)

But he hastens on to greater things, and celebrates the day, by proving that the Church of England is essentially Popish, and denouncing it as evil. Thus he writes:—

"But it must be observed, there are certain leading peculiarities about these Roman Catholic principles and opinions, which will serve to show, that there is really far more of Popery amongst Protestants, than at first sight they may be disposed to admit, or than is generally imagined. And if Popish views and principles are thus to be found amongst Protestants, will it not demonstrate, that Popery prevails, not only where it is ostensibly the religion of the land, but also where it is not—not only within the pale of the Romish Church, but also without it?"—p. 6.

He then proceeds to give illustrative proofs of "the Popery of Protestantism," as he facetiously calls it, the first of which is the exclusiveness of some sects, as of that which forms the Established Church, and which looks down upon all Dissenters as heretics or schismatics. "Surely," exclaims Mr. Slight, "such sentiments ill accord with the free and generous spirit of Protestantism. And what is more, they are plainly at variance with the lovely principles of the religion of Christ. They may pass current at Rome, but that they should ever be broached and published in Protestant England, and that too in the nineteenth century, is matter of painful regret. The Popery of Protestantism calls aloud for another reformation. Would that some gigantic arm were raised up to shake this cloud-capt Babylon to its base, and level it to the dust!" What already? After only 300 years, another reformation? We thought Babylon was a term too venerably applied to us, to be so easily transferred to Dr. Whittaker's pure, Apostolic Church. And is this the spirit in which delivery from Popery, through Coverdale's translation, is proposed to be commemorated? Is it by exciting odium against the main support of Protestantism? Is it by denouncing the Church, which proclaimed the commemorative festival, as equal to Popery in its corruption, and as calling already for another reformation? Listen now to the following appeal, based upon the passage just quoted:—

"When will there be a brotherly exchange of pulpits, so ardently desired by many, amongst ministers of various denominations? When will the clergyman of the Established Church be seen to stand in his dissenting brother's pulpit; and the dissenting minister, in his turn, be allowed to minister in the clergyman's pulpit?—For my own part, beloved brethren, it would afford me great pleasure to open this pulpit to any *godly evangelical minister* of the establishment, who will come into it, and preach the unsearchable riches of Christ."—p. 8.

What, exclusive even in this pathetic and liberal appeal? Is it only to one section of the Anglican Church, to the "godly and evangelical," that the right hand of fellowship is offered by the Dissenter? Is it not with *all* Protestants, who follow the Bible alone, that, on such an occasion, he will be ready to fraternize? But Mr. Slight finds still stronger indications of Popery in the Established Church:—

"Is it not of the nature of Popery to imagine, that the application of a little water to the body in baptism, effects the regeneration of the soul? Is it not of the nature of Popery to affirm, that none but ministers, ordained in one particular form and connection, are the true and lawful ministers of Christ? Is it not of the nature of Popery that sick and dying people should attach peculiar importance to their receiving the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, before they die, as if the act would serve as a passport to Heaven?"—p. 10.

Alas! who would have imagined, that the summons issued by clergymen of the English Church, would have been so answered; that the commemoration, which they proclaimed, would have been solemnized only by denouncing their Church as co-partner in guilt and corruption, with the one from whose dominion they rejoiced in having been delivered, by declaring it to be Babylon, and treating its sacraments and practices as fond and superstitious! What admirable harmony of principle, and unity of thought, is even the common ground of separation from us calculated to produce among Protestants!

But there yet remains the unkindest cut of all. We have seen the Minister of the Established Church excluding all foreign Protestants from a share in the blessings of the Reformation, and involving all separatists from his establishment in the guilt of schism; we have heard the Dissenter, almost at the same hour, retorting on that Church, as embodying the Popery against which the solemnity of that day summoned men to be on their guard; we shall now see the hostility, hitherto confined to the besieged and their besiegers, widely spreading itself within the city, at the very moment when its whole energies should be united against the pressure from without. With a slight alteration we may say

——— "*Iliacos extra muros peccator et intra.*"

The Third orator on our list, the Rev. Henry Roxby Maude, Vicar of St. Olave, and Rector of St. Martin's, belongs apparently to the evangelical section of the Anglican Church. We, of course, are not spared in the outpourings of his zealous spirit: and the "Man of Sin" and the "Son of Perdition" are made to stalk forth before the Rev. orator's audience, under the hideous and odious aspect of our "forbidding

to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats!" (pp. 9, 10.) But he has evidently a pet theory, which forms the basis of some interesting remarks. It is, that all men are naturally Papists: "every unconverted human being," he says, "is in heart a Papist. Turn back to the records of Grecian and Roman superstition, and in them you may trace Popery. Look towards the polished infidels of India, and behold them suspended from the hook, or crushed beneath the car of Juggernaut. Again, turn to the untutored savages of Africa, and the same spirit, under different aspects, will be found to actuate them all." (p. 11.) Here, at least, is a novel argument in favour of our claim to the title "Catholic;" for it gives our religion universality far beyond what we ever pretended to. For ages since the days of Julian and Faustus, writers had tried to annoy us by calling us imitators of Grecian and Roman idolatry, and copiers of Indian superstitions. We like the conversion of the argument, and admire the ingenuity, which makes all these nations, and the Africans to boot, right proper Papists. But mark what follows:—

"No; detesting, as well we may, this bias of the human breast, we need not scruple to aver our belief, that, even in this comparatively enlightened age, too many there are among the ranks of nominal Protestants, who, could they blind their reason to the gross absurdities involved in such profession, would gladly sink into the extended arms of the See of Rome, and surrender the keeping of their consciences to those, who are content to make void the word of God through human tradition."—p. 11!

It is not, perhaps, difficult to understand what portion of the Church is here signified, as already impregnated with the salt of Popery; but, to aid our researches, we will call in one, who evidently entertains similar views, and is more fearless in exposing them. The Rev. Mr. Bickersteth's "*Remarks on the progress of Popery*"\* have gone through three editions at least, and may consequently be supposed to express the feelings of a large class of churchmen, among whom he is numbered, as rector of Watton. We conceive we have a right to place him in the same category as the preceding authors; for he approves, at least, of their doings, in these words;—"The preaching of Tercentenary Sermons, on the 4th of October 1835, was a commencement of a practice, too important, and too useful to be discontinued." (p. 70.) He is, indeed, a man in whom the bowels of controversial mercy have been wrung dry of all compassion. His motto, like Laud's, is "thorough;" he bewails emancipation;

he weeps over the abolition of the declaration against transubstantiation, and the invocation of saints, as "a departure from the principles of Protestantism;" and he upbraids the lukewarmness of those, who are lax in preaching that Popery is the "mystery of iniquity, antichrist," and another personage of the apocalypse, over whose name modesty generally casts a veil, but on whose attributes and titles the riot of Mr. Bickersteth's imagination or zeal betrays him, more than once, into a coarseness of phraseology and of quotation, which, perhaps, has a zest, unknown to us poor sinners, for the palate of the saints. Catholics have been charged with uncharitableness in proclaiming danger of salvation to all that are not in the pale of Christ's true Church; but Mr. Bickersteth leaves no apology requisite for us in future. "The third duty," he tells us, "is to denounce God's wrath on adherence to Popery." And he then proceeds, in a fervid strain, to decry "the spirit of modern infidelity, miscalled liberalism," which proclaims it uncharitable to denounce God's judgments upon millions of our fellow subjects. (p. 72.) At any rate, he does not incur his own censure. With many protestations of charity, we are most feelingly given over to ruin and perdition.

We premise this statement, that the character of the writer, whose sentiments we are about to cite, may be properly known; but we must refer those to his book, who desire a rich treat of declamatory and exclamatory abuse, poured out in language, which may indeed be the dialect of zeal, but which, to our simple minds, appears not to be written with the alphabet of charity. Suffice it to say, that, in the exuberance which he manifests of the former quality, Popery is pronounced to be worse than infidelity. (p. 5.) But if we are thus placed in the comparative degree of evil and wickedness, what are we to think forms the superlative, and caps the climax of iniquity? Mohammedanism, peradventure, or Heathenism, or Judaism, or Socinianism? Oh no;—Protestantism! aye the Protestantism of the greater part of his own Church! Listen, reader, believe, and wonder:—

"A Protestant minister asked a Papist why she did not attend the Protestant Church. She replied, for three reasons; because she heard nothing of Jesus Christ, found no worshipping congregation, and saw no connection between the minister and the people. It is too true, this has been the awful state of many a nominally Protestant parish Church in our country; and we see in it why Popery has so grown; and Popery which does hold truth, though it be leavened, is better than such a formal dead Protestantism."—p. 66.

The religion of many a parish church, therefore, is more corrupt than even Popery, which is worse than infidelity! After

this, let Catholics be blamed for speaking severely or strongly against what they deem the errors of the Establishment, while her own sons thus vie with each other in vilifying all within her pale, who differ from their peculiar party. But this is not, by any means, the clearest passage, in Mr. Bickersteth's wrathful effusion, regarding the High-Church portion of his brethren. A considerable part of his treatise is occupied in proving that the growth of Popery is mainly owing to a decline of Protestant principles, (p. 27) and in denouncing, as unprotestant, the publications of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; (pp. 28-42) and then he speaks of a well-known knot of Oxford divines as "a highly respectable, learned, and devout class of men, the tendency of whose writings is departure from Protestantism, and approach to papal doctrine." (p. 44.)

One, who evidently thinks with the estimable men thus attacked, has stepped forth to confute Mr. Bickersteth,\* and has, in our opinion, succeeded, so far as an imperfect system, approximating to truth, can overthrow a tissue of rant and absurdity. The author cannot, indeed, escape from the foul blot which taints the pages of every Protestant controvertist whom we happen to open, that of calling us by names which have ever been used offensively. He speaks, too, of holding our doctrines up to "public detestation;" and winds up his denunciations by telling us, that our religion is "a mystery of iniquity." (p. 10) • These are, perhaps, propitiatory concessions made by the author, who satisfactorily answers Mr. Bickersteth's childish and false assertions, that the Catholic religion is antichrist,—because, forsooth, it denies Jesus Christ to have come in the flesh! He reprobates, in a tone much more worthy of one professing to be a minister of peace, not only the use of such opprobrious epithets towards us, as the Rector of Watton wished to have habitually in every Protestant mouth, but also, the preaching on themes only calculated to rouse the passions of the mob to deeds of violence (pp. 13, 8.) But he clearly sees, as does Dr. Whittaker, that *disunion in the Church* is the cause of the disorganization which seems to threaten Protestantism, a disunion which he acknowledges to be on the encrease both in England and in America. (p. 13.)

With him we fully agree, though with him we may lament it not. We have endeavoured by a simple, and, we think, a striking process, to show in what manner and to what extent this disunion pervades Protestantism. There seemed to be but one cardinal point, round which all Protestants would

---

\* Observations on a work by Mr. Bickersteth, entitled, "Remarks on the Progress of Popery." By the Rev. W. Brudenell Baxter, A.M. Lond. 1836.

centre, but one *oriflamme*, under the wavings of whose sacred symbol, all the scattered tribes of the Reformation would rally, and march in unity of purpose, but one common principle, which separated them now, as it did formerly, from the hostile camp, and which, by being universally and simultaneously proclaimed as a watch-word, might give a semblance, at least, of harmony and unanimity. It was determined to give to the world the grand spectacle of Protestants in union, for the brief space of one single day, by declaring that day sacred to the assertion of this one indivisible deed of settlement, in which every sect had an equal share and an equal provision made for its existence; and the result was, that a day was thus found whereon each denomination, as if by common consent, flung its condemnation upon all who differed from itself. Can anything be wanted stronger, to prove that dissent and disunion, yea, strife and bitterness, are essentially mixed up with the first fundamental principle of all Protestantism? We might have even pushed our argument much further, had we thought the subject sufficiently interesting to a majority of our readers. For we could have shown how the preacher of each sect has made use of the occasion to establish his own favourite dogma of christianity, as the subject of the day's rejoicing, and to propose his own panacea for the acknowledged evils, which have invaded, and the foreseen dangers which still threaten, the fabric of Protestantism. Like the persons mentioned in the apologue, each one recommends the city walls to be built of the material on which his own craft is engaged. Dr. Whittaker wants church authority and control, in matters ecclesiastical; the others require only the preaching of the total corruption of man, and of the all-sufficiency of redemption through Christ; while Mr. Slight, indulging in a flight of eloquence peculiar to himself, exclaims that "the last named doctrine (the sinner's justification through faith) was the thunderbolt, which the immortal Luther hurled at the towers and battlements of Popery." Who does not expect to hear, in the next sentence, the crash of ruin, which so mighty a stroke, from such an arm, must have occasioned? We, at least, already saw, in fancy, the turrets nodding to their fall, and the bastions rent and riven by the thunderbolt of this protestant Boanerges. But listen to the sublime effect of the "immortal" stroke. "It (the thunderbolt) fell on the *toes* of the great image of superstition"—surely it crushed *them* at least? oh no:—"and they *began* to crumble into dust!" (p. 15) How correct the aim, and how deadly its effects!

By the remarks, in which we have indulged, we do not apprehend that we can have offended men of a moderate and



charitable spirit among Protestants; for they must reprobate, as much as we, these ill-judged attempts to get up a No-popery cry, under the cloak of a religious institution, and to place the point at issue between the two religions upon false grounds, supporting their side only by unfeeling calumny, and coarse abuse. Against such as assail us thus, we shall always feel it our duty to rise, armed with keener criticism and severer reproof; though self-respect will, we trust, be sufficient to preserve us from falling into their faults, and stooping to the use of opprobrious epithets or unfair representations. But such as contradict our faith in an honest and friendly spirit, who, in the substance of their statements regarding us, depart not wittingly from truth, who, in their arguments, avoid all tortuous and uncandid logic, and, in their tone and style, violate not the courtesies of society,—such, as thus take the field against us, shall find us ever ready to meet them, with unvarnished argument, and with a reciprocation of every kindly feeling.

We hesitate not to assert that the era of excitement and passion in religious discussion has passed away: we can now, thank God, make ourselves heard, and we are willingly listened to by our fellow subjects. The appointment of days and seasons for the celebration of anti-catholic feelings will no more answer, than did the collection of mobs, in former times, to burn our places of worship, or the later gatherings of men and women in the area of Exeter Hall, for purposes not more holy, and certainly not less incendiary. We are loth to touch upon this theme again, after the full and satisfactory exposure made in our last number; but the connexion between the scenes of that place and our present topic forces it upon us. When we entered that hall, and, casting up our eyes, saw, inscribed over its portal, the expressive name ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΕΙΟΝ, as if to indicate a place where brethren love, and are taught to love, we were tempted to feel, in spite of sad experience, a hope, an augury, that justice or charity would at last influence the proceedings of those, who had chosen such a motto. We allude, of course, to that meeting which took place shortly after the appearance of our last number, wherein one of the most shameless exhibitions ever witnessed was publicly made. We mean not to enter into any refutation of the false and deceptive reasoning there displayed, for we hold it positively beneath notice: nor do we intend to dwell upon the farce of pretending that any absent member of parliament would have been heard, when those who were present, and whose profession particularly qualified them to grapple with their assailants, were forbidden to reply. It is not to such things that we mean to advert. It is the shameless effrontery of a second appearance before an assembly

of Englishmen, after the cruel manner in which their feelings had been played with on the first occasion, that chiefly excites our indignation. That one individual on earth may have a forehead, proof against the self-inflicted pillory of standing in the face of those who had witnessed his previous conduct, experience has now proved to be possible; but, where he summoned courage to invite those, whom he had made partakers of his degradation, to place their feelings and characters once more under his control, it is beyond our knowledge of human nature to discover. There must be deep stores of unflinching hardihood, laid up in dark corners of the mind, which we hope never to explore. When we recollect the afflicting spectacle of the preceding assembly, the approximation to savage ferocity in the expression of many around us, upon the forged epistle being read, their knitted brows and scowling glances, the deep and half suppressed growl of execration which fretted in their throats, till vented in a fierce yell of inhuman applause; when we remember the bitter retort, in accents of scorn cast upon us, as we remarked, to one who asked us the date of the document, that a few days would prove it spurious; but still more, when we recall to mind the feverish excitement of the audience below us, of thousands of females, whose cheeks glowed with a hectic fire, and whose eyes flashed with a frantic glare; when we calculate the pitch of fanatical excitement to which they must have all been raised, and then the consequent proportionate reaction which must have taken place, not merely on the return of good-sense to its habitual dominion, but still more on the discovery that they had given themselves up to such unworthy feelings at the bidding of forgery and deceit, we can hardly estimate the depth of self-rebuke and inward degradation, which they must have felt, or the swell of contemptuous anger that must have arisen against the man, who first used the cheat, then defended it, and afterwards had courage enough to summon them once more to meet him, and let him juggle them out of their propriety of behaviour, and all their dignity of sentiment. Yet there, in their presence, he stood; unshamed and unshrinking, behind his store of books, even as the juggler behind his cups and balls. And as the latter seeks to encrease the amazement of his gaping spectators, by shaking out each time a pellet of larger dimensions, till one of enormous size is produced, so did the reverend trickster seek to astound his audience by similar progressiveness in his marvels. Last year, the object of his attack was a simple priest, poor Peter Dens; and little *duodecimos* issued from his trunk, to the delight of his yet inexperienced auditory. But, on the 14th of July, he aimed at nobler quarry; bishops and archbishops were his game, the mysterious box was opened,

and out flew *quartos*; bibles without their covers, and covers without their leaves appeared; till Dr. Murray and all his brethren were proved guilty of we know not what, by the quickness with which one was substituted for the other. We thought the powers of such conjuration were exhausted, and wondered what would next come forth, as he stood once more behind the leathern trunk, that repository whence, on the previous occasion, had issued weapons, which the chairman characterized as drawn from "the armoury of Satan." Well, it opened; and, this time, appeared pregnant with enormous *folios*, almost an entire *Bullarium* hidden in its controversial womb;—for now all inferior orders of the hierarchy were to be overlooked, and Popes alone were to be his aim. We ask, what shall we come to next? What treat of sufficient magnitude, whether in the subject or in the instruments of display, remains in store for the next general meeting?—Yes, there is one which would astonish us more than all the past, and would efface them for ever from our memory. Let us have a display of candour and fairness, of liberality and charity; let us have argument instead of declamation, true statements in place of groundless assertions, and then we may own the place to be not unworthy of the name inscribed over its door.

But, to return from this digression: it is a frightful thing to convoke assemblies of men, whether by crowding them into one hall, or by summoning them, as on the fourth of October, to their places of worship, for the purpose of teaching them how to hate. It is revolting to think how a day, the sabbath of God's rest, should have been appointed throughout the land for its inhabitants to meet, and whet their keenest feelings of religious abhorrence towards their fellow-countrymen, upon the book of God's word. It is humiliating to see the principle of faith, the groundwork of religion to a large body of christians, commemorated only by the most glaring violation of its first practical commandment, that of love. It is instructive, however, to trace the essentially disuniting, disorganizing character of this principle, by finding its solemnization lead to such strife and dissension among those who have adopted it. This for the present, is the point to which we wish to turn our reader's attention; that, if a Catholic, he may bless Providence for having placed him out of such a self-divided kingdom, and exert himself to bring others into the unity of faith, and if a Protestant, his attention may be drawn to the insecurity of the foundations on which he reposes. If a cranny suddenly appear in the wall of our house, or if fragments of plaster fall from its ceilings, we apprehend danger, and are warned by such symptomatic intimations, to seek a shelter elsewhere. What then should it be when the walls of a church are torn and

breached by outward attack, and when they, who should serve as its pillars, are seen to rush against each other, and jostle together for their mutual overthrow? Surely, even if there were not so high and holy an authority on the instability of a kingdom and a house thus divided, human calculations would lead us to conclude, that here the government is unstable, and the building unsound.

---

ART. III.—1. *Third Report of the Commissioners for inquiring into the Condition of the Poorer Classes in Ireland.*

2. *The Evils of the State of Ireland, their Causes, and their Remedy—A Poor Law.* By John Revans.

IT would be a needless labour and waste of time, in the present stage of the question, to enter upon a formal inquiry into the necessity of a legislative provision for the Irish poor. That necessity is no longer disputed. The inquiries which have been made, and the reports, founded upon them, which have been laid before the world, have silenced all open opposition to so just and irresistible a cause. A mass of evidence is in the hands of the public, exhibiting such a variety and extent of hitherto unalleviated suffering, such a waste of human life and happiness, such scenes of degradation and despair, that no man, reading those painful recitals, “and having human feelings” about him, can resist the imperative and urgent necessity of a Poor Law.

We are not going to distress the minds of our readers by displaying detached groups, or individual scenes of woe, taken from the frightful panorama of affliction which is spread out before us. The Irish reader needs not to be told of sufferings with which his eye is familiar, and his heart sick : and a sufficient publication and exposure of our country’s misery has taken place, to awaken the justice and sympathies of the British people. They have heard enough of the multitudes of their fellow subjects, who lie among straw or rushes, upon damp clay floors, without covering enough for warmth or decency. They have heard enough of the annual typhus, and of those “periodical” visitations of famine, to which mighty statesmen find it so easy to inure their sensibilities. They have heard enough of that herb of scarcity, the yellow charlock, which, with nettles and other weeds, often constitutes the summer food of tens of thousands ; of the enormous rents paid by the poor for the hovels they inhabit ; of the miserable and uncertain pittance of wages they can earn ; and of the merci-

less and reckless barbarism with which they are frequently turned adrift, to seek shelter and employment on the world's wide waste. These things are now as familiar to the thoughts of English readers, as they are to the observation and experience of those, who cannot go to their doors without seeing abundant proofs that they exist. Why should we repeat them in detail? Why harass the patience of the public and wear out its pity with "nothing but songs of death?" Such representations have done their work. They have confounded the hard-hearted, awakened the indifferent, and fixed the attention of the humane and wise upon this important question.

And a more important question has not been proposed or submitted to legislative operation, during the present generation. Emancipation, Parliamentary and Municipal Reform, the Abolition of Tithes, are all great questions. By their discussion or effects, they have wrought mighty changes, and still point to events of vast magnitude and moment yet to come. But hitherto society has been more affected by the great principles they involve, than by any matured fruits it has gathered from them. We see Emancipation gradually but slowly smoothing away the inequalities, which an obsolete and unnatural system had raised, to the injury and hindrance of good government. Reform has, as yet, done little more than "put forth the tender leaves of hope," which the progress of legislation may, and, if the people wills it, must, bring to perfection. By Corporate Reform, we expect and seek nothing more than to share the rank and the rights of citizens in our own towns, where we have been too long treated as serfs and aliens. By the extinction of Tithes, we hope for the restoration of peace between different denominations of Christians, and for a more just and beneficial appropriation of a public impost. The effects of these various measures will not be instantaneous; they must await the course of time, to develop and mature them. But a Poor Law will introduce a principle both new in itself, and productive of immediate results of the utmost consequence. Upon property, upon morality, upon the diverse relations and bonds of society, upon the rights and condition of the poor, and the power and resources of the affluent, it will exercise an influence altogether unknown before.

Nor is the importance of the subject diminished by the consideration, that it is not an experiment *in corpore vili*, which may be abandoned, should it fail of the expected results. It will admit of no return to the old track: once begun, the trial must go on to an end. It will be competent for future legislation to amend, to alter, to improve; but not absolutely to annul. The subject must be taken up for better or worse. This con-

sideration, though no excuse for further delay, in a matter, whose repeated discussion has long since convinced the minds of all men that "something must be done," is nevertheless a very strong motive for cautious deliberation, and painful solicitude, in the choice of a measure. Nor can we see any impediment in the nature of the question, to blind or mislead men as to its real tendencies and relations. It is no party question; and we do most cordially desire, that, throughout the weighty deliberations which must ensue, party feelings may not be suffered to interpose their perverting influences. We hope that men of all political distinctions will approach it, as a question which must outlive contemporary interests, and produce a permanent effect upon the social frame; extending beyond ourselves, and these days in which we live, to the times of our remote descendants, and to periods when the destinies of our country will be swayed by other hands.

As yet, so far as we find ourselves at liberty to judge from appearances, there is a concord of opinion as to the general principle. All parties, or at least the leading and most respectable men of every party, concur in viewing the present condition of the Irish poor as disgraceful to the State, which has so long acquiesced in it, and in demanding its full and speedy amelioration. The extremes of political society meet upon this point. Whether they will agree as well about the means, as they do, or seem to do, upon the principle; whether they will hold together to the end, as cordially as they are disposed to start in company, is a matter about which we are not quite so well satisfied. But supposing all who admit the principle to be equally sincere and singleminded with respect to its development, we cannot now see, how party politics can be brought into the discussion. At all events, it shall be *our* endeavour to steer wide of such a mischief; to enter upon the inquiry calmly and temperately, and to go through it, if we can answer for ourselves, with perfect impartiality.

In such a spirit we take up the third Report of the Commissioners for inquiring into the condition of the Irish poor, the result of a laborious and diligent inquiry of two years, setting forth the plans of those eminent persons, or of the major part of them, for relieving the sufferers, which, in their previous reports, had been so truly, and minutely depicted. It is an able and well-digested report, indicating as well the intelligence and care which have been bestowed upon it, as the sympathy of the compilers with the poor sufferers who had been committed to their inspection. But our admiration of the talent and benevolence, displayed in the Report, will not carry us so far as to

induce us to concur in the plan which the Commissioners propose for adoption. This is too complicated and involved for practical effect: in its endeavours to shun a great and formidable necessity, it flies to numerous expedients, perplexing enough in themselves, uncertain in their tendency, and, in the aggregate, presenting difficulties and embarrassments far exceeding those which they are designed to obviate.

The main difficulty of this subject lies in the vast number of men, who are able to work, but who cannot now obtain, in Ireland, sufficient employment to maintain themselves, and the families who depend upon their exertions for subsistence. Of this class it is stated, that *five hundred and eighty-five thousand* able bodied men, having besides *one million eight hundred thousand* persons dependent upon them, are out of work and in distress, during thirty weeks of the year! Such an army of paupers, by whatever means collected, might well strike dismay into the hearts of those, who were commissioned to devise means to provide for them. They seem as the multitude in the wilderness, fainting by the way, and having no prospect of relief from human resources. The Commissioners, with their hundred pennyworth of bread, shrink from the arduous task of attempting to feed them. They are afraid to undertake it, and want faith to make the attempt in the only way in which it can be successful.

They are told of the English system; but they cannot recommend that for Ireland, because "the circumstances of the two countries differ widely." There is no doubt of that. The circumstances of Ireland are very different from those of England: But why are they so? what constitutes the *wide* difference? Not surely the "narrow frith" that parts them. No—but they differ, because the laws of England have given rights and privileges to the people of that country, which no law, as yet, has given to the people of Ireland. Before the act of the 43d of Elizabeth was passed, the circumstances of the English peasantry were exactly similar to those of the Irish peasantry in the *Georgian Era*. There was, as Mr. Revans, in his excellent pamphlet, observes, "the same extreme desire to obtain land, and, consequently, the same willingness to submit to exorbitant rents, which now characterise the Irish peasantry. The practice of ejecting the peasantry from their dwellings, of destroying them, and joining the small tillage farms, and laying them down in grass, seems then to have been as common in England as it is now in Ireland."

The resemblance also holds good as to the riotous and lawless conduct which naturally flowed from such a state of things. Agrarian tumults and insurrections broke out in the rural and

populous districts, so exactly similar, in character and in design, to the Rockite outrages, that this intelligent writer declares, that, when reading the accounts of them, "it is difficult to prevent the impression that they refer to the outrages, committed a few years since, by the Terry Alts in the county Clare. The nature of the outrages, and the causes of them, are so very similar." And, to complete the parallel, we find, from statements in the preambles of several acts passed in that reign; that "England was, at that period, as Ireland is now, infested by hordes of wandering beggars." No wonder if the circumstances of the two countries *now* materially differ; for a timely remedy was applied, with a steady and fearless hand, to the evils which afflicted England, while the plague has been left to work its wasting way, to the present moment, in the vitals of Ireland. England has ceased to be the scene of warfare between the landlord and the tenant. There is no stripping of roofs, or turning out upon the highways; no consequent vagrancy, or disaffection, or bloodshed. "After the passing of the 43d of Elizabeth," says Mr. Revans, "which gave to the destitute able-bodied a right to relief, I find no further mention of Agrarian outrages, of extensive misery among the peasantry, or of the nuisance caused by large bodies of vagrants." And are we then still to be deterred, by the "different circumstances" of the two countries, from applying the same mode of relief to Ireland, which proved so eminently successful in raising the condition of the English peasantry, from misery and insubordination, to a state of security, and peace, and comfort? Surely there is nothing in the constitution, or the *idiosyncrasy* of the Irish patient, to render him callous to the same method of treatment!

Oh, but "the *circumstances*" of the country, say the Commissioners, will not admit of the application of the Poor Law, now existing in England, to the poor of Ireland; and they ground this opinion on three distinct considerations. First, the English system is chiefly directed to put the able-bodied upon their own resources, and force them, when they cannot find employment at home, to seek it elsewhere, through migration. Now, the Irish peasant wants no stimulus to urge him to this; for he is as anxious to procure employment at or near home, as, failing that, he is ready to seek it by emigration to distant settlements. It is not the unwillingness to work, therefore, but the impossibility of obtaining work, which the legislature has to combat in Ireland. This is quite true, in the present state of the country; but there is a remedy for it, and that remedy is as simple, as, we have no doubt we shall prove it, adequate, before we have done with the subject.



The second objection to the English Poor Law, is stated to be, the expense of erecting workhouses, which the Commissioners estimate at four millions sterling, and of afterwards maintaining them, which is computed at five millions annually. In forming these calculations, they suppose that provision should be made for the reception, and continual maintenance, of 2,385,000 persons, being the whole number of able-bodied labourers now out of work, including the families dependent on them. The extravagance of such a calculation is so glaring, that we only think it necessary to direct public attention to it.

Thirdly, they are of opinion, that the Irish peasantry would rebel against the system, and "rather endure any misery than make a workhouse their domicile;" that "it would be regarded, by the bulk of the population, as a stratagem for debarring them of that right to employment and support, with which the law professed to invest them;" and that, if any of them were induced to accept the shelter thus offered to them, the discipline of the place would "produce resistance, tumults would ensue, and, after much trouble, expense, and mischief, the system would be abandoned altogether." With these opinions, we marvel not that the Commissioners "consider it morally, indeed physically, impossible so to provide for such a multitude, or even to attempt it with safety."

We quite agree with them, that the habits, tastes, and affections of the Irish peasantry, are against a workhouse system. No people, under heaven, would feel more acutely the necessity which should part them from those who shared their troubles, and cheered and sustained their spirits, in the midst of adversity. Most irksome would it be to leave that circle, to which the Irishman's heart ever fondly turns, and seek the cold comfort of a parish workhouse. Few, we are assured, would take up their rest in such an abode, with its prison-like restrictions, for a lengthened term. But the same affectionate feeling towards his family, which would render such a sojourn intolerable to an Irish peasant, would also reconcile him to its occasional shelter, when he once became convinced that its establishment was conducive to the permanent security and support, both of himself and of his children. And a very short time, or we are greatly mistaken, would suffice to convince him of that. It is true, as the Commissioners state, that "the labouring class are eager for work, and that work there is not for them; and that they are, *therefore*, and not from any fault of their own, in permanent want." The dread of the workhouse, consequently, is unnecessary to put *them* on their own resources to procure employment. But are there not *others*, whom the dread of the same object

might put upon *their* resources, with better effect, in order to find work for the poor man? Would not the necessity, imposed upon the man of property, and upon the state, of maintaining such an asylum for the able-bodied out of work, give a spur to the benevolence of the rich, and ultimately cause employment to abound? If, as Mr. Revans argues, and we think unanswerably, "the workhouse provision constitutes a certain, as well as a safe, *minimum to earnings*," the Irish peasantry will not be long in discovering that fact; and the knowledge of such a circumstance will soon assist them to overcome their repugnance to a restraint, so salutary in its operation upon their future prospects. They are too well trained to habits of self-denial, even where no promise of advantage supports them, to kick against a trial of patience, so obviously intended and calculated for their good.

As to the idea of the Houses of Refuge becoming permanently occupied by the labouring class, a class so "eager for work," we need scarcely attempt to show how vain is such an apprehension. For the Report itself, in the next paragraph to that in which the objection is started, and in which one half of the gross rental of the country is threatened with absorption, by the permanent pauper inmates of those asylums, very frankly acknowledges, that the Commissioners do not think that "such an amount of expense would, in point of fact, be incurred." We feel very happy that we can conscientiously subscribe to this opinion, and for the same reason, amongst others, with that alleged in the Report, namely, the general repugnance of the people to so disagreeable a residence. Our concurrence, too, is grounded on something beyond mere opinion. Experience of the system in England fully proves, that no superiority of fare, or entertainment, can induce the poor to rest content within the walls of a workhouse, while separated from their families, or debarred from that, which, in every state and stage of fortune, is as dear as life itself, an uncontrolled command of their own time and actions. Mr. Revans visited a workhouse in Nottinghamshire, where, to speak without a figure, the inmates "fared sumptuously every day," and were allowed to pass their time without labour, and in unrestrained intercourse with the female members of their families. Yet very rarely did able-bodied persons apply for admission into that house, a circumstance which the master explained, by saying,—“Oh, Sir, I keep the key of the door, and I very seldom allow the able-bodied people to go out, which they don't like; so, if they can possibly live out, they won't come in.” The same sentiment undoubtedly prevails, with at least equal force, in the breasts of the Irish peasantry. They would endure much hardship, rather than submit to the restraint and discipline of a work-

house. But, at the same time, extreme distress and hunger, which "makes all things sweet except itself," will often render such an asylum acceptable to them, as a temporary shelter; and this is precisely the sort of estimation in which it is desirable that those receptacles should be held. For thus they will be subservient to necessities, for which no other present help can be devised; at the same time, that there will be no danger of their becoming heavily burdensome to the country, as repressing a spirit of industry and independence among the poor, or affording an acceptable retreat to the profligate and the idle.

The Commissioners object also, and with good reason, to a provision for forcing the landholders to employ the poor, or giving what is called "parochial employment." Through that door entered all the abuse, waste, and immorality, which, before the enactment of the Poor Law Amendment Bill, constituted the crying evil and danger of the Poor Law system in England, and which, if suffered to go forward and accumulate, would have inevitably swept away the barriers of property, paralyzed and destroyed commercial enterprise, and involved the distinctions of society in inextricable confusion.

Of this truth, the remarkable case of Cholesbury, a parish in Berkshire, which is cited by the Commissioners, affords a striking illustration. There the rates went on with fearful progression, to meet the demand for out-of-door employment, until, at length, the "landlords gave up their rents, the farmers their tenancies, and the clergyman his glebe and his tithes!" All this, however, proved inadequate to the still encreasing distress; and the neighbouring parishes were actually obliged to help those paupers, who were already in possession of every inch of land, and of all that it produced, in their own parish!

This was an extreme case; but numerous others, not so leveling in degree, yet still intolerably exactive and ruinous, occurred in every part of England, to the oppression and discouragement of the gentry and middle classes, especially of the farmers; whilst the effect upon the moral habits of the peasantry were most deplorable. On the one side, an offer was made of labour, which those on the other side, little as they might want it, were not at liberty absolutely to refuse. Hence, a continual contest was kept up between the occupier of the land and the labourer, in which it was the endeavour of the former to evade the necessity of encumbering himself with more help than he required, and of the latter to oblige him, by representations of real or fictitious distress, and not unfrequently by violence, to take it. Under the operation of such a system, the feelings of mutual reliance and good-will were quickly obliterated, and a sentiment

of sullen hostility and mistrust was engendered in its room, most detrimental to the interests of both; inspiring the one with harshness and severity, and the other, with a secret resolution to render back as little service as possible, for the extorted support which he received. Nor was the condition of the labourer improved by the great sacrifices made to keep him from want. He was, and felt himself, a degraded man; and by the humiliating and fraudulent means, to which he was often compelled to resort, in order to extort parochial assistance, he soon lost the love of independence, which was once the boast of the sturdy British peasant. Its bread was no more sweet to him. He preferred the lazy, reckless life of the parish pauper, with all the squalid, improvident, and intemperate habits, which naturally grew out of that worst kind of villanage, to the hard-earned crust of honest, independent labour. Wherever the system of "out-of-door relief, or parochial employment," was most prevalent, there drunkenness and other degrading vices flourished; and it is most gratifying to find, as we see it stated in the Report of the English Poor Law Commissioners, that the change, which has been introduced into the system, has already produced a visible improvement in the habits of the English peasant. "While the indolence, generated by the old system of parochial employment, has been thus superseded by habits of industry, the train of vices, generated by indolence, are found to be gradually diminishing. The increase of sobriety is frequently indicated to us, in the progress of the change, by the complaints of the beer-shop keepers, that the consumption of beer has been diminished, and by their activity in opposing the progress of a further change."

Looking to these facts, and to the character of our countrymen, unhappily too prone to habits of improvidence, the Commissioners "cannot recommend parochial employment, or out-door relief, for the labourers of Ireland:" and to the propriety and justice of this conclusion we find ourselves constrained to subscribe.

But what then do they recommend? It seems absurd to talk of a provision for the poor, and yet leave the unemployed able-bodied poor, who constitute so large a proportion of the whole, unprovided for. The Commissioners will not open the workhouse for them. They object, with equal vehemence, to finding parochial employment for them, or to giving them relief out of doors. Here, then, the difficulty, which met us at starting, is still in our way; and how is it to be got over?—The Commissioners propose a number of expedients for that purpose, some of which we shall now briefly consider.

The first thing they suggest is *Emigration*;—Emigration, as

a means of carrying off "the redundancy of labour, which now exists in Ireland." With this view they recommend the establishment of "*Emigration Depôts*," for such as may be "unable to find free and profitable employment in Ireland;" these depôts to serve for their reception and intermediate support; such support to be afforded only, "as a preliminary to Emigration;" and a free passage to be provided, at the public expense, conjointly, in some instances, with that of the landlords, for those who cannot afford to pay for themselves. "It is thus, *and thus only*"—says the Report—"that the market of labour in Ireland can be relieved from the weight that is now upon it, or the labourer be raised from his present prostrate state." What the expense of all this might be, the Commissioners have omitted to state; but it may be deduced from several passages in their Report, without going further for proof, that it would be very considerable; for, according to their statements, the correctness of which we see no reason to question, vast numbers would avail themselves of the opportunity, thus afforded, of leaving their homes, and their country, for ever. Those who are able to work, and cannot now find free and profitable labour in Ireland, are said to amount, together with their families and dependents, to two millions three hundred and eighty five thousand persons. Now, if the Commissioners, to fortify their objection against workhouses, assumed that accommodations should necessarily be provided for all this number, are we not equally warranted in calculating, that they will all claim the refuge of the *Emigration Depôts*, and demand a free passage to the Colonies? We appeal to the Report itself, which states, that "the feelings of the suffering labourers in Ireland are decidedly in favour of Emigration; they do not desire workhouses, but they do desire a free passage to a Colony, where they may have the means of living by their industry:" and we refer to the voluminous extracts, which it brings forward, from the evidence taken before the Assistant Commissioners, showing the universal prevalence of those feelings in the breasts of the Irish peasants. They do desire to abandon the shores of their native land, that land, which they love with a romantic affection. It is, to them, a land of misery and privation, though Providence has blessed it with fertility and beauty, scattered amongst its hills and in its green vallies, sources of wealth as profuse as they are various, and continually offers, on all sides, abundant and remunerative occupation to the energies and productive industry of its people. Yet they are desirous to quit this, "their own, their native land," for the aguish swamps of Canada!

Do we ask the reason of this strange passion? It is not to be

found in a rambling disposition, a love of change, or an impatience of legal restraint; but in utter and absolute necessity.

“ Their poverty, and not their will, consents : ”

and if, then, with their known attachment to “ the land that bore them,” and to the associations of clan and kindred for which they are, at all times, and on the most trivial, as well as on the greatest occasions, ready to sacrifice life itself, the Irish peasantry are still desirous to obtain a free passage to the Colonies, this is only a proof of the extreme and hopeless wretchedness of their condition at home. Whoever has seen the departure of a family, or of the inhabitants of a village, upon such a momentous expedition, will not find it easy to forget the lamentations and the agony, with which the poor Exiles of Erin bid a last farewell to the scenes of their childhood. From the youngest child, who is capable of reflection, to the fathers and brothers of the party, one wild cry of sorrow and despair is heard to rise. As they go forth, every village joins in the dismal concert, until the poor emigrants have passed beyond the limits of friendship and acquaintance. Thence, onward to the coast, they are objects of universal pity. “ God help them ! ” — “ The Lord go on their road ! ” — and such like tender and pious ejaculations speed them on their way, from every house by which they bend their mournful steps. The labourers in the fields rest on their spades, to offer a prayer in their behalf, as when a funeral passes by; and, in short, every movement and expression both of the emigrants and of those who remain behind, shows that this mode of relief for the suffering poor of Ireland, “ disguise itself as it will, is still a *bitter draught*.”

But when, in addition to all this, we take into account the cost at which the Commissioners propose to carry out this their sovereign and only antidote for a surplusage of labour, we can scarcely contain our astonishment, that wise and benevolent men should dream of such an outlay, for the purpose of making “ aliens ” of those, whom the same amount would convert into useful and happy citizens. Their views on this head are set forth in the twenty-third section of the Report : —

“ We propose that arrangements for carrying on Emigration shall be made between the Commissioners of Poor Laws and the Colonial Office, and that *all poor persons, whose circumstances shall require it, shall be furnished with a free passage, and with the means of settling themselves* in an approved British Colony, to which convicts are *not* sent. *We propose too, that the means of Emigration shall be provided for the destitute of every class and description, who are fit subjects for Emigration; that depôts*

shall be established, where all, who desire to emigrate, may be received in the way we shall mention; that those, who are fit for emigration, shall be there selected for the purpose, and that those, who are not, shall be provided for, under the directions of the Poor Law Commissioners."

In connexion with the above proposal, they further suggest that "Penitentiaries shall be established, to which vagrants, when taken up, shall be sent, and that, if convicted (before the next Quarter Sessions), these persons shall be removed to a free Colony, not a penal one, to be appointed by the Colonial Department." By the provisions suggested in these sections, the Commissioners assert,—and, to mark their confidence, we suppose, in their plan, they print the whole passage in italics,—that "All poor persons who cannot find the means of support at home, and who are willing to live by their labour abroad, will be furnished with the means of doing so, and with intermediate support, if fit to emigrate; and, if not, will be otherwise provided for; while the idle, who would rather beg than labour, will be taken up, and the evil of vagrancy suppressed."

They, who were startled at the apprehended expense of constructing workhouses, and maintaining them, for the relief of the able-bodied out of work, are yet willing to encounter all these various, complicated, and heavy charges, in the attempt to reduce the population. *Workhouses* are not to be erected, for fear of the expense; but *Depôts* are. Surely much is "in a name." These *Depôts* must be capable of affording shelter to *all*, who cannot find free and profitable employment, and are willing to seek it abroad. All, who desire to emigrate, are to be sent, passage free, to a British Colony; and not only so, but they are to be maintained, until means can be conveniently found of sending them out; and after they have been thus sent abroad, they are to be provided with the means of settling themselves in the country to which they are removed. We do not quarrel with this latter provision. It is humane; and, if emigration be adopted as the *panacea*, it is indispensable: for, to turn them loose upon a distant shore, without such assistance, would be nearly as great cruelty as to expose them upon a desolate island, or to abandon them at sea, without rudder or compass. But look to the expense of it, and consider all that might be done towards rendering these poor people valuable and contented members of society at home, with half the outlay thus incurred for the sake of getting rid of them.\*

---

\* Mr. Revans says (with some exaggeration, we admit) "one fourth of the population of Ireland might be withdrawn, and yet wages not be raised. To emigrate 1,500,000 or 2,000,000 of people in one year, would be impossible. To spread the

Our feeling, with regard to emigration, leads us to place it in a very secondary degree indeed, whether it be regarded as a means of diminishing pauperism, or as calculated, in any material degree, to promote the peace of Ireland, and the security of life and property within its confines. By itself, and in its *practicable* opera-

emigration over a number of years, would not have the desired effect upon wages. The natural increase of the population would supply nearly as many as the emigration would subtract."

Of the expense of emigration, on a large scale, some notion may be formed from the following return of the cost of sending out *twenty-seven families*, from the estates of the Marquess of Lansdowne, in the Queen's county, to Quebec. Their mere conveyance to the American coast, without the charge of "emigration dépôts" before embarkation, or of providing for, and settling, them in new habitations, after their arrival in Canada, cost 451*l.* 19*s.* At the same average rate, the mere cost of the voyage for 100,000 families, that is, only two-fifths of the unemployed labouring class, would amount to nearly 1,700,000*l.* We should be, perhaps, considerably within the mark, if we stated that the expense of their previous maintenance in the emigration dépôts, and of settling them afterwards in a proper manner in America, would make the difference between that sum and *three millions*. A "pretty considerable" price for getting rid of 100,000 families.

The statement, which we subjoin, reflects the highest credit on the Noble Marquess, and on the manager of his Queen's county property.

Return of the expense of sending emigrants from Luggacurren, in the Queen's county, the estate of the Marquess of Lansdowne, to New Ross and Waterford, and from thence to Quebec.

No. of Families.	Individuals.	Expenses to New Ross and Waterford.	Passage and Subsistence.	Passage, including head-money at Quebec.	Provisions.	Total Expende.	Average cost per head.
		£ s.	£ s.	£	£	£ s.	£ s. d.
10	62	6 16	156 15	—	—	163 11	2 12 9
8	46	6 3	115 0	—	—	121 3	2 12 8
9	60	7 5	—	115	45	167 5	2 15 9
27	168	20 4	271 15	115	45	451 19	

The lands of Luggacurren contain 1687 acres, late Irish plantation measure, and fell into the proprietor's hands in March 1831, a season of very great disturbance and Agrarian crime. Notwithstanding this, the agent received the possession without any difficulty, from about 160 families; the lands were then surveyed and carefully divided; and were afterwards valued by a public valuator. They were then let to 90 families, on a five years' lease, at his valuation, being 2030*l.* per annum, on an understanding that, at the expiration of that period, such of them as were approved of should have a lease of one life or 21 years; and during the aforesaid period, an allowance of *one quarter's rent* was made to each tenant, for liming, draining, and other improvements. Of the 90 families, the agent found it necessary to remove *only 5 families*; these lands have now been relet, and leases executed to 88 tenants, from the 25th of March 1836, for one life, or 21 years, at the original valuation, 1-8th being deducted from that amount, and tithe free. The largest farm contains 120 acres, and the smallest 2 acres, average extent of each holding, 19 acres. The highest rent is 42*s.* per acre, and the lowest 9*s.* 6*d.* average acreable rent 22*s.* 8*d.* including tithe composition. The tenants are all satisfied, have paid up their rents due on the 25th March last, and are now preparing to register a ten pound franchise."



tion, it could never have the effect, (by which alone such objects can be permanently achieved), of lowering the rents of the poor, or of raising the rate of wages; because, in order to produce those effects, it should be carried to an extent, which, to speak in the language of the Commissioners, is "morally, indeed physically, impossible."

Within the last seven years, two hundred and ten thousand persons, chiefly of the labouring class, have emigrated from Ireland. Yet, save by their own friends, and by those landlords who have profited by their removal, their departure is unnoticed and unfelt. By the community at large, and by the police, "*nobody is missed.*" Nor can we imagine that the subtraction of the same number, in a single year, (supposing it practicable) would, of itself, and unaided by other means, have much perceptible effect on the state of those who should be left behind. We are sure that the opinion of the witnesses in the barony of Clonlisk (King's county) is not exaggerated, and that it is equally applicable to most other parts of Ireland: viz.—"The witnesses find it difficult to say what number should be taken from the able-bodied population, to afford the labourer steady wages at a moderate rate. They think that, though twenty per cent. were removed, it would have but little effect upon wages. They do not think it would raise them *one penny* per day."

But though we set no value upon emigration, as a primary and essential principle of relief, we are far from proposing to close the door against it. As subsidiary to a large and substantial provision for the poor, it may become highly available to that important purpose. Restless and adventurous spirits should be supplied with "room and verge enough" to indulge their vein; and others, for various reasons, may be anxious to emigrate, whose secession might prove a relief both to them and to the country. There are also many places, where the evils arising from the excess of the population above the demand for labour, and above all reasonable expectation of its being at any future time required for local employment, can only be remedied by the removal of some portion of the people to a more profitable field of work. In such cases, means should be provided, as ample as a regard for the interest and permanent prosperity of the poor themselves may require. But we do think, that we are not extravagant in looking forward to the time, when, even in the judgment of political economists, Ireland will not contain an able-bodied man too many for her own wants; and that this will be accomplished without the aid either of emigration, or of war, or of any other drain, invented by the policy or the wickedness

of man. Let security be given for the investment of capital in manufactures, and in extensive agricultural improvements—a security which can only be effected by first giving the poor a secure resting-place in their own country, free from the danger and the apprehension of being driven out to destitute vagrancy—and then our labourers will find employment in abundance. Every arm will then be required, for every arm can then be turned to profit.

But let us be just to the Commissioners. Whilst they speak of emigration as the only means of “relieving the market of labour from the weight that is *now* upon it,” they also suggest other modes of repressing such redundancy, with a view to keep as large a proportion, as they can, of the population, profitably and usefully employed at home. They desire also to qualify their recommendation of that specific, which they “do not look to as an object to be permanently pursued upon any extensive scale,” but at the same time, they insist upon it, as “an auxiliary essential to a commencing course of amelioration.”—We now proceed to take the remaining suggestions of this report into consideration.

The plan of improvement, recommended by the Commissioners, proceeds also upon a commencing principle of amelioration. “As the business of agriculture is, at present, the only pursuit, for which the body of the people of Ireland are qualified by habit, it is chiefly through it that a general improvement in their condition can be primarily wrought.” Afterwards, as the labourer’s condition improves, trade and mechanical labour will, of course, flourish in proportion, and “we may expect that division of labour in Ireland, which exists in England, and which is at once an acting and reacting cause and consequence of the wealth of nations.”

There can scarcely be two opinions about the truth of this. If agriculture really prospers, and we account it no prosperity, where the labourer is excluded, as is *now* the case in Ireland, from his rightful share, all other interests must flourish along with it; for the benefits of remunerative employment will diffuse themselves among the warehouses and the workshops; and thus, in addition to the wealth which will be so created, new sources of occupation and industry will be opened to the poor, and new ties of reciprocal attachment will be created, to bind them for ever to their native country. But the Report sets out with the startling proposition,\* that the Irish labourer has now the same proportion of the produce of the land in his own country, as the English labourer has in England; and thence argues, that, in order to advance his earnings out of the land, its productiveness

must be increased in proportion; for that, otherwise, there is danger of “throwing land out of cultivation, and involving, not only landlords and farmers, but the labourers and the whole community in general destruction.” The facts, on which this statement rests, are these:—England, with thirty-four million acres of cultivated land, employs fewer agricultural labourers, by nearly 100,000, than Ireland employs in the cultivation of fourteen millions and a half: in other words, there are, in Ireland, about *five* agricultural labourers for every *two* engaged on the same quantity of land in Great Britain. Now, the agricultural produce of Great Britain is more than four times that of Ireland; and hence the Commissioners argue, that, if a proportional share of the produce of each country were given to its own labourers, there would be more than four times as much for the British labourer, as for the Irish, and that, in point of fact, the earnings of agricultural labourers in the two countries are in that proportion; the English labourer’s earnings averaging from 8*s.* to 10*s.* a week, and those of the Irishman from 2*s.* to 2*s.* 6*d.*; so that the land, in its present state of cultivation in Ireland, could not afford higher wages to the labourer than it actually pays, without hazarding those fearful consequences, which have been already mentioned.

• It would surprise the authors of this Report to be told, that weavers, employed on the hand loom, were entitled to no higher wages, in proportion to the amount of work done by them, than the operatives employed in a power-loom factory: or, to bring the illustration nearer home, that labourers, hired to thresh out corn with a flail, would have no right to murmur, if their recompense bore merely the same proportion to the quantity of grain separated from the straw, as that of other men, employed in another part of the country, in feeding a threshing-mill. But the process of agricultural business done in England has the same analogy (though the proportions are certainly nothing like so wide) to that done in Ireland, as labour, performed by the aid of machinery, has to labour performed by the hand. A vast deal of that kind of labour, which Irishmen perform with the spade, is done in England by horses. The operations of planting and digging potatoes, for example, besides those of trenching, moulding, and weeding them, are performed, in most parts of Ireland, by manual labour. In England, they are performed with the plough. Again, in England, the farmer, in sowing grain, rarely employs any assistance but that of the harrow and the roller. In most parts of Ireland, the same work is done with the shovel and the spade. There is another work, too, which, although, strictly speaking, it has no connexion with husbandry, devolves neces-

sarily upon the agriculturist, and occupies a large portion of the Irish labourer's time and industry; that is, the duty of providing and laying in the yearly supply of firing. In England, this operation is performed, as far as the agricultural labourer's part of it is concerned, by going to the mouth of the coal pit, or to the ship, or the canal boat, and fetching home what is there put into his waggon. The Irish labourer, on the other hand, is employed, during several weeks in the best and most profitable part of the year, in the cutting, rearing, and stacking of turf; a truly slavish and laborious occupation. In short, the labourer, in England, is commonly engaged in directing and guiding the force of horse or machine power, to extract produce from the land, or render it marketable: whilst, in Ireland, he must perform all this, or at least by far the greater part of it, himself. What parity of justice, then, is there between the claims of the Irish and of the English labourer upon the produce of the land? or how can it be maintained, that, by recompensing the former in a higher proportion to the produce, which they severally help to raise, than the labourer of Great Britain, he will receive "more than ought to come to his share?" Surely, if the workman, whose industry is aided by the employment of horses and machinery, in every instance where they can be employed with effect, and whose bodily labour or skill, compared with such help, constitutes but a fraction of the productive power that is used,<sup>2</sup> if such a one is entitled, for his personal share in the work, to a certain proportion of the produce, the workman who supplies, by his own exertions, the functions of all other auxiliaries, is entitled to the additional benefit of such *extra* labour and service. If the former has a right to a fourth, the latter may fairly claim at least a third, of the produce; for he contributes more than the difference, in the excess of his labour, over that of the other.

The comparison, therefore, instituted by the Commissioners, is fallacious, and so is the conclusion which they draw from it. They state that the English labourer raises four times as much produce as the Irish, and, therefore, that the recompense, which they severally receive, is in just proportion and cannot be altered, without involving the whole community in general destruction. It is not the English labourer *alone*, who, raises four times as much produce as the Irish, *in the same circumstances*; but it is the English labourer, *assisted by horses, and manure, and an expensive system of husbandry*, supported by the capital of his master, who surpasses his Irish competitor, *unprovided with any one of these helps and advantages*.

This is the true state of the case; and we leave it, then, to any man of common sense to say, whether, with such a difference

existing in the “appliances and means,” it is necessary, in order to keep land in cultivation, and preserve landlords, farmers, and labourers from destruction, that the nominal proportion between the prices of human labour, in England and Ireland, must continue the same. The English employer can afford to pay his workmen from 8s. to 10s. a week, though this is a small item in the expense of cultivating his farm. The Irish employer, on the other hand, incurs no other considerable outlay in the cultivation of his ground, beyond the hire of his labourers; and yet, he only pays them in the same ratio to the produce, as the man, whose capital is sunk to a large amount, and who has, besides, so many heavy demands to meet. This may be a “proportion” *in figures*; but it is anything else in reality.

Even in the present state, then, of agricultural produce and wages, if it be essential that an exact relative proportion should exist between them in the several parts of the United Kingdom, the sooner some effective measures shall be taken to raise the amount of the latter in Ireland, the better, according to the notions of the Commissioners, will it be for those great and momentous interests, which they consider to be endangered by a disparity. Many landholders may doubtless be pinched, by such an addition to their expenditure; and the inconvenience will probably extend higher than the mere tenantry; but if they are not required to pay more in proportion than the English farmer, and are yet unable to bear it, that inability must proceed from something else than any undue advantage thus given to the latter. However, a more equitable distribution of the profits threatens no result more awful to the community than the removal, or resignation, of some rack-rented tenants, and, perhaps, a transfer of some now grossly mismanaged and neglected estates from their *nominal* owners, to masters who possess the means of putting forth their resources for the common benefit. Whether the inability, therefore, to afford the same proportion of wages as that which is actually paid by the British employer, may proceed from a different proportion of rent pressing upon the tenant, or from peculiar engagements and embarrassments affecting the net income of the landlord, such impediments must not interfere, to prevent the adoption of some legislative measures for securing a fair and equal proportion of justice to the labourer. The land is well able to “render unto all their due.” Let not any make their private difficulties, which, however incurred, have no right to be taken into the consideration of this question, or their fanciful valuations of what really belongs to them, an excuse for engrossing “more than ought to come to their share.” The Commissioners, desirous to “observe the utmost caution

in applying a remedy to the evils they have to deal with," lest they should run into those which an erroneous comparison had led them to apprehend, suggest that the improvement of the condition of the Irish labourers shall be preceded a little way by that of the land, so as to keep up the relative proportion, with England, between work done, and produce brought to market. To this end, they propose to institute a Board for carrying into effect a very comprehensive system of national improvement. It is to cause surveys, valuations, and partitions to be made of waste lands, with a view to their being brought into cultivation; the requisite drains and roads through such waste lands to be made by the Board of Works, which, in consideration thereof, shall have an allotment of certain parts of the land so reclaimed, made to it, in trust for the public; and these allotments, being fenced and otherwise improved, at the discretion of the Board of Improvement, shall be sold, or let, subject to conditions imposed by that Board. Next, with respect to lands already in cultivation, the Board of Improvement is to be invested with authority, according to the principle of More O'Ferrall's Drainage Act, to cause all lands to be kept duly drained and fenced, under the directions of Local Commissioners, appointed for that purpose, who shall also be a Court of Record for their District, with powers, in conjunction with a Jury, to make presentments and levy rates, for the purpose of carrying the works entrusted to them into execution. There is, moreover, to be an engineer for each district, named by the Board of Works, which Board is to have a large fund placed at its immediate disposal, for the execution of all the additional duties thus imposed upon it. The Board of Improvement is farther to have the power of making provision "for the occupants of cabins, which may be nuisances;" and the way in which this is to be done is worthy of note. The Local Commissioners, above mentioned, are, with a Jury, to present these nuisances, and a certain sum for each, which shall be levied, partly on the *immediate landlord*, and partly on the whole district. The Board of Works then shall, under the directions of the Board of Improvement, let to the occupant of every such cabin a portion of land, reclaimed from the waste, which shall have been allotted to it, and shall assist him to the extent, at least, of the sum presented for his use, in building another cottage.

The Board of Improvement is, moreover, to establish an Agricultural Model School, and district or parochial schools, having four or five acres of land annexed to each, for the purpose of instructing those occupiers of land, who do the work of it themselves, in the most approved methods of farming, and "affording them examples of order and cleanliness and good cottier-hus-

bandry." In subordination to these objects, are provisions for enabling tenants for life to make leases, and to charge the inheritance to a certain extent, subject to the approbation of the Board, with sums expended on lasting improvements. A Fiscal Board is also recommended for every county, to be chosen by those whom they shall be authorised to tax, with the same powers of making presentments for public works as grand juries now possess. The chief object of this proposal is, to ensure the employment of the poor, more than it is now customary to employ them, in local public works, that so, "by a better arrangement, profitable labour may be found for many of the unemployed, at those periods of the year when there is the greatest destitution."

These are the principal suggestions "as to improvement," which are offered in the Report. Some of them are well worthy of attention, being adapted to the circumstances of the country, and to the peculiar necessities of its poor inhabitants. Others we think too easily convertible into jobs, to be safely experimented upon, in a community, whose very virtues lean to jobbing's side. We allude more particularly to the process of getting rid of cabin-nuisances, "at the expense of the county," and of the immediate landlords.\* The occupant is to be removed to a station on the reclaimed bog or mountain, and located in a domicile, "at least," *as good as the nuisance* from which he was ejected. There is no provision, in the whole of these arrangements, which appears to us more liable to abuse, than this; nor one which gives so much colour to an imputation, sometimes cast upon the Commissioners, of being more careful to gratify the proprietors of estates, than to relieve, or accommodate the poor straggling appendages of the soil. The allotments nominally appropriated to the Board of Works, for public benefit, would, by this management, be absorbed, in a great measure, if not entirely, in clearing the cultivated and ornamental parts of the country of unsightly or disagreeable neighbours; and that, at a considerable expense, of which, in most cases, no portion

---

\* By "immediate landlords," we presume the report intends a side-blow at the middlemen, who are accused of having brought these redundant swarms of human animals upon the face of the country. They rarely enjoy such a permanent interest in the soil, as to justify the laying a tax upon them, to the entire exemption of the proprietor, for the sake of improving his estate. If it is considered, that, because the middleman may have placed the under-tenant in the cabin, he is, therefore, justly chargeable with the cost of his removal for another's benefit, this is manifestly unjust. For no man ought to be punished by an *ex post facto* law; and, until very lately, a tenant was not forbidden to sub-let his land in small divisions. We have known instances, on the contrary, of tenants having been required, as they valued the good-will of the owner, to make as many Forty-Shilling Freeholders, as their holdings would cut up into. Would it not be a hard case to saddle those men, now, with the expense of clearing away *The Cabin Nuisance*?

whatever would be defrayed by the person receiving the greatest ultimate advantage from such removal.

Viewing the whole plan, however, in its general adaptation to the proposed object, it would be a narrow and ignorant ground of objection to say, that a proposition cannot be good for the poor, because it has a manifest tendency to serve the rich. Nothing can be more false, or more inimical to social order or happiness, than such a notion. To give real security and contentment to any one great division of a community, the whole must be rendered secure and contented: and in Ireland especially, for whose soil "nature has done so much and man so little," it seems impossible, without violating the laws and rights of property, to devise any plan of improving the condition of the people "through the business of agriculture," without, at the same time, benefitting the owners of the land. But is this an objection? No:—Quite the contrary. It is the strongest recommendation we can conceive of any system of agricultural employment, that it is calculated to advance the interests of all classes concerned or connected with that pursuit. It is only when the effects remain in the exclusive enjoyment of the landlord, whilst the labourers, who contribute to his prosperity, are cut off from any permanent advantages arising from it, that the public has a right to complain. Such was the case with respect to the Government Loans, advanced, some years ago, to private gentlemen, as trustees, for the employment of the poor in their respective neighbourhoods. Of public funds, distributed and applied in that way, Mr. Revans says no more than the truth, when he affirms, that "ninety-nine pounds will go to increase rent-rolls, for every pound that benefits the poorer classes." But very different results might naturally be looked for under the regulations of a well ordered and defined system, checked by the vigilant control of popular inspection.

Our objections, then, to this proposed Board of Improvement, with its numerous dependencies and operations, have no connection with any invidious feeling against the owners of property. Nor, in fact, do we absolutely oppose it. There are many excellent and useful suggestions in this plan, which may be adopted with great advantage both to the country at large, and to the labouring and industrious classes in particular: and when a legal provision is made for the able-bodied poor, we doubt not there will be a general desire for the adoption of these, or similar, methods of employing them, according to the view of the Commissioners, so as to "improve property at the expense of the property improved." The landlords, as soon as they feel it to be



their own interest that the poor should be fully and profitably occupied, (and a Poor Law will soon bring the knowledge home to them,) will, of their own free motion, bethink them of extensive and permanent sources of employment; and if they require Acts of Parliament to facilitate such undertakings, and reduce them to a general system, they will readily obtain them. In the mean time, however, we see no good purpose it can serve, to encumber this grave question with plans and projects, which can, with propriety, only be considered as supplemental to a fixed provision for the poor, and by no means as proper to be substituted in its place. For the great evil of the present state of our poor, which consists in the uncertainty of any permanent resting place for them, and the consequent desperation and tenacity, with which they adhere to "*the bit of land*,"—that fruitful source of disaffection and agrarian outrage,—remains scarcely touched by this system of improvement. Nay, by fostering and encouraging their agricultural taste, without giving any security for its permanent gratification and enjoyment, the mischief might be enhanced; and thus, English capital, and skill, and industry, to the introduction of which we look for eventual prosperity, would be frightened as far as ever from our shores.

In the same class, and liable to the same objections, we are disposed to place the new and increased powers and duties proposed to be given to the Board of Works, with respect to the prosecution of public works of various kinds, enumerated in the Report. Such matters, however, we throw aside for the present, not as being unimportant, or of little value in themselves, but because they tend to mystify the simple question,—*Is Ireland to have a Poor Law?*

The Commissioners answer this question in the affirmative. But how?—To what extent are they willing to afford the benefits of direct relief?

They would make compulsory rates for the relief and support, within the walls of public institutions, of lunatics, idiots, epileptic persons, cripples, deaf and dumb, and blind poor, and all who labour under permanent bodily infirmities; also, for the relief of the sick poor, in hospitals, or out of doors, as the necessity of their several cases may require; also, for the purpose of emigration, for the support of penitentiaries, to which vagrants may be sent, and for the maintenance of deserted children; also towards the relief of aged and infirm persons, of orphans, of helpless widows with young children, of the families of sick persons, and of those who are suffering from casual destitution. This is the utmost relief which they are prepared to recommend, of that

species which is commonly understood, and expected, as proceeding from a Poor Law ; and this, we say without hesitation,—*this will not do.*

A difference of opinion exists between the Commissioners, whether the amount of relief, which they propose for the last-named class of sufferers, should be levied by legal compulsion, or left, in part, to the voluntary benevolence of the public ; and hence it is, that they speak of making provision, and levying rates, “*towards*” their relief. We think the enormous pile of damning facts, which they have collected for their own information, and for that of the public, should have been sufficient to keep them unanimous on that point. What relief, worthy to be called so, do the aged and infirm, the orphans, the helpless widows with young children, the families of the sick, or the casually destitute, receive from voluntary charity in Ireland ? There is, indeed, much spontaneous dispensation of alms practised in Ireland, and the value of the charity thus bestowed, chiefly by the smaller farmers and cottiers, is estimated at a very large amount. Those of the Commissioners, who are advocates of the voluntary system, loosely state it as being, “on the most moderate computation, from one to two millions.” To be sure, there is a vast difference, especially in so poor a country, between the two sums : but suppose that a million is annually expended, we should rather say wasted, in this manner, we cannot see, in such a fact, grounds for expecting that the same amount, or any thing like it, would be placed by the persons, who now distribute it, at the disposal of a Central Board, or handed over to local associations for a similar purpose. By far the largest proportion of these benefactions is dealt out to wandering mendicants, who go from door to door, craving “something for God’s sake.” It is rarely offered, or given, to the poor of the same neighbourhood, who do not beg, and many of whom are in greater distress, and known to be so, than the wandering beggar. At least, we should say, that not to one-tenth of the extent that unknown vagrants are relieved, is aid afforded, by the same class of persons, to needy and destitute cabin-keepers.

We would be the last to detract from the merits of our struggling countrymen, who, out of their own penury and want, still have

“ A heart for pity, and a hand  
Open as day to melting charity.”

If the kind and benevolent feeling were not warm and active in their breasts, to constrain them to acts of compassion, when the stranger stood upon their threshold, they would doubtless close the door against him. But the fact we have mentioned, that they do not go in quest of distress, nor tender assistance,

while it remains passive and uncomplaining, is a sufficient evidence to us, that the alms-giving, for which they are celebrated, is not of that purely voluntary kind which would prompt them, under other circumstances, to come forward with their contributions. The ancient custom of hospitality has a considerable share in their bountiful conduct to strangers. An Irishman considers it a dishonour to turn away a stranger hungry from his hearth. On the same principle are they influenced by the dread of "*The Beggar's Curse*," which is connected partly with those rites so sacred in the eyes of every primitive people, and partly with that religious sentiment, which teaches that, as "the blessing of Him that was ready to perish" is precious, so, and in the same degree, are his maledictions tremendous. We do not, in reality, attribute too great importance to this awful ban, when we say, that the fear of it often compels the good house-wife to open her little store, which otherwise she would prefer to keep unbroken for the satisfaction of claims dearer, and far more sacred, than those of the sturdy beggar. There is also frequently mingled with these feelings a consideration of prudence, and, if we may call it so, of police, which counsels the farmers to buy protection from pillage and wanton mischief, to which the exposed state of their hen-roosts, potato-pits and cow-houses, renders them so tempting a prey: and though this, and some other reflections which we have made, may seem to place the sympathy, so honourably evinced by our poor countrymen towards those who are a little worse off in the world than themselves, on too low a ground; yet, we are sure that they have each its distinct operation, in producing effects so creditable to their character as a people. But there is yet, above all these, a constraint, originating in positive religious obligation, which makes alms-giving a duty, so long as there continues a necessity and an opportunity of exercising it; a duty at once, and an exercise of virtue, from which they cannot shrink; which their Church, no less than their divine lawgiver, requires of them; and for which they can claim no other merit, than that of having discharged a great and imperative obligation. And is not this compulsion? Certainly a happy necessity—an elevated and dignified compulsion; but still a compulsion; and a compulsion which taxes the best part of society, while the shameless, the heartless, and the profane, are suffered to go free.

What, then—would we repress or damp this willingness to communicate and impart of their scanty store, which constitutes so noble a peculiarity in the character of the Irish peasantry? No—Heaven forbid! We only wish that it were diffused equally, and under a better regulation, through all classes; and that its call were as prevailing, and its knock as loud, at the castles of

the great, as upon the cottage-doors of the poor. But we would, at the same time, show, by explaining the various inducements which render it effective, as a means of assistance to one class of sufferers, how little it can be relied on, as a principle applicable to the necessities of all the poor, and to be called into play in connexion with a systematic provision for their relief.

We heed not the sentimental cant, with which many interested, and some well-meaning persons, meet the proposition of a legal assessment. They are apprehensive, forsooth, that the kindly and generous feelings, which form the basis of voluntary benevolence, will be utterly dissolved, and melt away before the constraint of the law; and that the amiable dispositions and sensibilities of the Irish character are in danger of being obliterated, by being brought into contact with any other kind of obligation. They think it as absurd to require humanity, as Falstaff did to expect truth, "upon compulsion;" and they would, perhaps, stand aghast if they were told, what is, nevertheless, true, that the charity, which they would fain portray in such ethereal and unearthly guise, coincides, in all its distinctive qualities, with the poet's loose conception of the most gross and vicious form of earthly passion:—

" Love free as air, at sight of human ties,  
Spreads his light wings, and in a moment flies."

There might be something like reason in what they say, if men were, or ought to be, the mere toys of impulse, moved or blown about, in every situation, by their feelings, without the rule of judgment. But when we apply such romantic jargon to the deliberate consideration of a most solemn and serious duty, it becomes not only ridiculous, but in a very high degree culpable; being injurious alike to the true moral sense, and to the interests which it is brought forward to serve.

With respect to the practice of voluntary alms-giving in Ireland—as far as it proceeds from motives of pure benevolence and religious duty—(which we are sure it does, in numerous instances)—we have no fear—there are, indeed, no grounds for fearing—that the force of those sentiments would be weakened by a legal provision for the poor; but, at the same time, we are as firmly convinced that the relief now distributed through their impulse and suggestion, would not be rendered spontaneously available to the purposes, or amenable to the rules, of such voluntary associations as the Report contemplates. On the other hand, if the charity called "Voluntary" be extorted in any instances—and we are sure it is in many—by improper importunity, by terror, by the exhibition of fictitious distress and exaggerated misery, if it be lavished without discrimination or reflection, and do, in fact, cherish and

perpetuate the evil which it is meant to remove, then, the sooner that kind of benevolence is got rid of the better. Finally, whether the principle be mixed, or purely charitable, whether it be such as deserves unqualified encouragement, or such as would be improved by correction and reform, experience proves, that it is not to be relied on, as adequate to the distresses of the poor, or sufficient to enforce their claims upon the community at large. Does this voluntary benevolence stimulate those who witness it, to go and do in like manner? Does it melt those to pity who have no pity? Does it thaw the icy heart of the miser, subdue the forestaller, arouse the heedless, or shame the unfeeling? No; but it relieves them from the necessity of giving any thing. It saves them, as well as their benevolent neighbours, from pillage. It keeps the destitute and importunate from their doors. It acts as a direct bounty upon selfishness and inhumanity, while it taxes the good, in exact proportion to their goodness.

If it served no other beneficial purpose, than to break through the unmerited exemption, which such heartless beings enjoy, and to preserve the morals of the public from the evil infection of their example, they should be made contributory, along with their more free-hearted neighbours, to the maintenance of the poor. It is neither justice nor good policy to suffer them any longer to escape.

The reliance, which the majority of the Commissioners appear to place in the spontaneous charity of persons in a higher rank of life, can best be estimated by the knowledge of what that charity is and has been. There are many excellent institutions, for the benefit of poor persons, in Ireland, supported by gratuitous contributions, and supported well. Such are the several Asylums for Female Penitents, Orphan Societies, Schools, at which poor children, not orphans, are clothed and fed, as well as taught, Asylums for the Blind, Deaf and Dumb, and various other beneficent establishments. But all these—at least the exceptions are not important—are connected with one or other of the prevailing modes of religious belief. They are severally maintained at the expense, and for the exclusive benefit, of Protestants or of Catholics; and to some of those belonging to the former, places of worship are attached, at which doctrines are constantly promulgated, the most intolerant, and most repugnant, in our opinion, to the spirit of universal love, which should form the basis and mainspring of all charitable institutions.

These establishments are maintained in affluence, by “the religious zeal” of their respective contributors; and their flourishing condition presents a most remarkable contrast to the struggling existence, which institutions of acknowledged utility, de-

signed for the relief of paupers, without any religious distinction, are enabled to drag out. The bankrupt state of "the Mendicity Institutions of Dublin, Limerick, Newry, Birr, Sligo, Waterford, and Londonderry," is appealed to, by the three Commissioners who differ from their associates, in confirmation of their statement, that "where voluntary associations for the relief of the most helpless poor have been organized, and directed with great skill, and a degree of perseverance which the purest benevolence could alone support, these institutions have not only failed in providing for the necessities of their respective districts, but in inducing the majority of wealthy proprietors and inhabitants to contribute to the support of institutions so meritorious, and so freed from even a suspicion of blame." Now, Mendicity Associations are the only institutions known in Ireland for the exclusive relief of absolute pauperism. If, therefore, the Voluntary Principle were in any case to be trusted as an efficient help to the destitute poor, it would show itself in the support of these associations. But we see that it is efficient only in combination with strong religious prepossessions, of a kind which it would be impossible, even if it were not most improper, to excite, in cases which, like the present, should admit of no distinctions, except between the greater sufferer and the less. The difficulty, indeed, of removing or stifling such prepossessions, is, perhaps, not the least among the causes of that apathy, with which the efforts of a few benevolent philanthropists, to prolong the existence of the excellent institutions to which we have referred, are generally received. For years, they have been kept alive by a system of menace and importunity, not more painful to humanity, than disgraceful to the community, where it is necessary to have recourse to such means in such a cause. How constantly are the newspapers filled with urgent remonstrances and appeals? How often are lists published and circulated, displaying, in different columns, the names of those who contribute, and of those who do not? How often has the threat been repeated, of turning the inmates of those abodes of misery loose upon the world? How often has the day been fixed for parading the aged, the feeble, the deformed, the halt, the blind, in reproachful procession, through the streets and squares of our proud Metropolis? It is thus that charity is extorted, like drops of blood, from an inconsiderable number of the inhabitants of our towns; and this is the best, the most illustrious, specimen of *Voluntary* Benefactions for the Relief of Pauperism, which the advocates of that system can bring forward, to give the world assurance of their plan.\*

---

\* In a late number of the Limerick Chronicle, we find the following public appeal, by which it appears, that even the dread of a spreading and pestilential disease, now

Oh, but we are told that the voluntary system answers most admirably in Scotland, and that it has been found to diminish the expense of maintaining the poor in that country, in a very remarkable manner. The Scotch are an understanding and calculating people; they undertake nothing without well counting the cost; and hence they seldom engage in any plan which they do not execute carefully and with effect. There is no race of men to whom the working out of the Voluntary System, if they once took it up with a firm purpose, might be more safely committed. For their habits and character are equally against a hasty adoption of an unexamined principle, and in favour of a fair and patient trial, after they have resolved to adopt it. If, in some Scotch parishes, it has been agreed to try the method of

---

raging in that city, is not sufficient to stimulate the charity of the affluent to come forward to the relief of the hapless inmates of the Fever Hospital; although the "expenditure for each patient, from the time of admission to his discharge, does not exceed nine shillings and sixpence!" The reader will perceive, that the Committee of the Institution are endeavouring to spur the Voluntary Benevolence of their fellow townsmen, à l'Ecossoise, by threatening to call for a Board of Health, at "a most enormous expense to the city." We shall be curious to know the result of this appeal to the bosoms of the Limerick Gentry.—*Adhuc cessat voluntas!*

"PUBLIC APPEAL.—FEVER HOSPITAL.—The Committee, on a review of the Registry of the Limerick Fever Hospital, exhibiting as it does an admission of 2833 Patients, from the 6th of January last to the present period, which, added to the numbers remaining on that day, 112, forms an aggregate of 2915 for that time on the Hospital books; and, finding the continued prevalence of Fever of a most contagious nature, are called upon to state to the public these melancholy facts, and at the same time to express their feelings that, without a considerable increase of funds, it will not be in their power to continue the blessings of this Institution to the numerous afflicted poor of this city and the surrounding districts.

"The Committee, in making this appeal to the public, feel a pride in stating, that in no institution have the funds been managed with more economy; this will at once be observed by the simple fact, that, with every expense attendant throughout the establishment, the average expenditure for each patient, from the time of admission to his discharge, has not hitherto exceeded nine shillings and sixpence.

"The Committee regret, however, although the average expenditure is so moderate, that the balance now in the Treasurer's hands will not suffice for more than a few weeks; and, therefore, in placing those melancholy facts before a humane and benevolent public, confidently call upon them for effective support in the furtherance of this great call of charity.

"The Committee cannot conclude this part of their report, without impressing upon all classes of the community, how intimately connected with their individual safety is the upholding of this institution. Surely, if the Committee is obliged, from want of funds, to close the doors, Fever, hitherto concentrated within the walls of the hospital, must unavoidably visit the houses of all, and spread general desolation throughout this district.

"The Committee feel it a duty to state, that, unless the public come forward, and liberally contribute on this occasion, they will have to choose between two alternatives, either to close the hospital, or call for a Board of Health, agreeably to the 58th Geo. III. which would be attended with a most enormous expense to the city. To relieve suffering humanity, the Committee feel bound; they, therefore, implore the public to prevent an adoption of the latter alternative, which, in the event of necessity, they must submit to."

self-taxation, in preference to that of assessment, we have no doubt of their steadiness and integrity, in making it serve the purposes both of economy, as regards themselves, and of attention to the comforts of the poor. But what is the real nature of the boasted Voluntary System of our Scottish neighbours? They make their election, not between giving and not giving, but between giving upon compulsion, and giving voluntarily; for one or the other they must do. The illustration is somewhat hackneyed, of *the Beggar in Gil Blas*; but it is a case strictly in point. Such voluntary benevolence is—“*La Charité des fidèles effrayés.*”

“The Scotch System,” says Mr. Revans, “is always adduced as an instance of the advantages of the voluntary over the compulsory system. Those, who are so loud in their praises of the Scotch system, seem to have forgotten that the advantages are more likely in the mode of administering, than in the mode of raising, the fund. It does not appear to me, however, that any one knows much about the Scotch system; many pretend to the knowledge, but I suspect its worth. I have seen how completely the facts were at variance with the assertions, made relative to England and Ireland, previously to the searching enquiries undertaken by the government; but even admitting all that is claimed for the administration in Scotland, and that the administration depends on the mode of collection, I can only say that the collection is, to all intents and purposes, a compulsory collection. The law says, if you do not give sufficient, you shall be assessed. This is much of the sort of request which a civil highwayman makes, when he lets you see that, if civility wont do, force will be applied. The Voluntary system is the English system, if the English please to adopt it. The law only directs the overseer to raise by assessment whatever is required for the poor; it does not direct him to refuse voluntary contributions. If, therefore, a few foolish people in a parish choose to relieve their neighbours from their fair share of the contribution, they may indulge their kindly propensities, without any risk of interference from the law. Our Northern neighbours, who are not the least shrewd people of the Three Kingdoms, are beginning to discover that their voluntary system is excellent for relieving the uncharitable at the expense of the charitable,—a mere illustration of working the willing horse to death; and they are, consequently, very generally adopting assessment.”

The Scotch system, then, in two words, is no more than this: They tax themselves, to avoid being taxed. His Majesty's Commissioners may call this “voluntary” if they please; but then, so is the English system, as Mr. Revans well observes, voluntary too; for if the parishioners agree, among themselves, to obviate the necessity of an assessment, there is nothing to prevent them. The Scotch Poor Law is, in fact, the same as the 43d of Elizabeth, with this difference in the machinery by which it is



worked, that it is administered by the minister and elders of the parish in Scotland, and by magistrates and overseers in England. The former, also, we believe, assume a kind of discretionary power, for which, however, they are responsible, of determining who are worthy objects of relief. But the legal compulsion to maintain the poor exists, and can be enforced, in every instance, where it is improperly resisted.

We have not left ourselves room to go into the consideration of the Scotch system as closely or minutely as we could have wished. But the general principle of it, which has been correctly stated, disposes of the argument for instituting a voluntary scheme of relief, upon that precedent; for we see that there is nothing in it which may strictly be termed voluntary, except the choice between assessment and a self-imposed rate.

Besides the direct measures of relief recommended by the Report, there are other suggestions for preserving the labouring class from falling into that absolute pauperism, which results either from evil habits, or from the want of a little timely assistance on occasions of pressing need. To meet the latter case, in particular districts, loan funds are proposed; which, if carefully administered, would certainly be capable of affording much useful help to the industrious poor. They would, in fact, be found most advantageous, as adjuncts to a general system of relief, by fostering that spirit of independent exertion, which it would then, more than ever, be essential to encourage. They would also teach the common people the value of a good character, and enable them to derive advantage from those provident habits, which, in their present unhappy circumstances, seem to make little or no difference in their actual condition.

Another circumstance, to which the Report adverts, as "one of the most prolific, assuredly the most pernicious, causes of Irish misery," is the inordinate use of ardent spirits. This is a habit which, in common with the Commissioners, we fear that "direct legislation cannot reach;" for to attain a radical and effectual cure, "the patient must minister unto himself." But we concur with them in the opinion, that a great temptation to it may be removed by putting an end to the sale of spirits on *Sundays*. In towns more particularly, the dissolute and wasteful habits, which cause so much of the sufferings of labourers and artisans, take their rise from the practice of Sunday tippling. The most confirmed drunkard, if he is obliged to earn his bread, abstains from indulgence on the days that he is at work; and it seldom happens, that, during the latter part of the week, at least, he is found to deviate, in any great degree, from the rules of temperance. But when Sunday releases him from toil, he finds the door of the

dram-shop open; and he is unable to resist the temptation. The latter half of that day is commonly devoted to the degrading and pauperising indulgence, which is there prepared for him; the following morning generally finds him in the same place; nor can he withdraw from its fascination so long as any portion of the previous week's earnings remains undissipated. The clause in Mr. O'Loughlen's Spirit License Act, which compels publicans to keep their houses closed till seven o'clock on Monday morning, has contributed much to induce workmen to return to their employment on that day, instead of wasting it at the dram-shop; and we are confident, that if effectual measures were taken to keep them from it, on the whole of Sunday, they would be much less disposed, than many of them still are, to carry their habits of intemperance into the middle of the week. On this point, the cooperation of the Catholic clergy may be of infinite use. Bishop Abraham, of Waterford and Lismore, is said to have proposed a rule of discipline in his diocese, restraining the sale or use of strong drink, on Sundays and holydays. We have not been able to ascertain whether it has yet come into operation. It was to be submitted, *pro forma*, to the judgment of the parochial clergy; and hence a delay may have occurred in reducing it to practice. If, however, the other spiritual directors of the people would join their authority to that of Dr. Abraham, (and that they will do so, if they shall deem it feasible, and within the legitimate bounds of their jurisdiction, we cannot doubt) more would be done towards reforming the manners of the people in this respect, and consequently towards improving their condition, than the united power and wisdom of the legislature could effect in a century.

We have now gone through the principal topics, which constitute the plan of relief recommended by the Commissioners; and stated wherein we concur in their suggestions, and wherein we think they ought not, or, on account of the difficulties they present, cannot, with any reasonable prospect of success, be adopted. It remains that we briefly state what measures of relief appear to us to be the most eligible, with reference to the necessities and means of the country, and to their probable effects upon the moral and physical condition of the people.

Although distress prevails in Ireland to an extent, and in a degree, unparalleled in any other civilized part of the world, it is worthy of remark that the poor are nevertheless supplied with food, and moreover, that, unless in seasons of dearth or scarcity, they are supplied with it in quantities at least sufficient to sustain life. In ordinary years, they are fed and supported out of the produce of the land: and so liberal and so easily obtained is the supply, at such times, that we have often known strolling mendi-

cants to turn from the doors of respectable houses, annoyed and disappointed at being offered potatoes or broken victuals, instead of the penny or the half-penny which they expected to receive.

We have already remarked that the voluntary benefactions, distributed in Ireland, may be estimated at more than one million annually, perhaps two: and we are inclined to believe that, in hard years, the money value of these gratuitous distributions even exceeds that amount, though the actual relief afforded falls infinitely short of what the judicious application of such a sum might dispense. The greater part of this bounty is absolutely thrown away. In many instances, it is given to those who do not want it, or who might, by honest labour, and abstinence from habits of profligacy and vice, contrive to do without it. The character or need of the applicant is, in fact, rarely taken into account, in determining his claim. No inquiry is ever made; but the idle, the dishonest, and the dissolute, have, and are aware that they have, as good a chance of obtaining a full share of the relief thus distributed, as those who are the victims of misfortune, or have fallen into distress through casualties, which neither virtue nor industry could avert. The consequence of this indiscriminate mode of charity is most pernicious both to "him that gives, and him that takes." For it confirms the one in his lazy and disreputable mode of life; and invites to the door of the other, the still increasing shoals of importunate depredators, whom his inconsiderate munificence inspires with fresh hopes and renewed activity.

But if the same amount of charity, which is thus worse than wasted, were made available to the relief of distress—real and unavoidable distress,—and placed under proper systematic regulation for that purpose, it would go far towards such a provision as is necessary for our poor. Suppose a million sterling pounds were annually collected into a public fund, to be applied, according to a fixed code of regulations, for the relief and aid of the really necessitous, it is a question if more would be required for *all the purposes* connected with that object. And would it not appear wonderful, if it should be ascertained, upon experiment, that Ireland, this abode of wretchedness, of indigence, and of starvation, has been for years in the custom of lavishing, in heedless, misplaced, and ineffectual bounty, a store sufficient to prevent the whole of the extreme misery of its people?

Nor is this, however striking, altogether beyond belief. It is a common thing, to see families in the receipt of a large income, living in a state of comparative indigence, without any apparent cause, except a want of management. Thus one man will keep his carriage, receive his friends, and, in all respects, maintain a

style suitable to his rank in society, while his next neighbour, perhaps, with an equal expenditure, and not a larger establishment, can hardly make a decent appearance in the streets. We see instances of this every day; and something of the same kind happens with regard to the hospitality and bounty dealt out to the poor in Ireland. It is run through, without method, and "*in a slobbering way.*" Our advice, therefore, is, that it should be brought together, placed under judicious and responsible management, and applied, in the most effectual, as well as the most economical, manner, to purposes of real utility and benevolence. Of course, we do not mean, that the same persons, or class of persons, who now bestow this amount of misapplied relief, should be looked to as the only, or the principal, contributors to the fund, which we propose to substitute in its room; but merely that, as the land now actually supports the poor, so the land should continue to yield that support, in conjunction with such assistance from other descriptions of property, and from the State, as shall be considered both expedient and just.

And in what form would we administer this support? Experience tells of but one safe and effectual mode of administering it to those who are capable, if they had the opportunities, of earning a subsistence; and that mode is, through *the Workhouse or Asylum*. It affords them necessary sustenance and shelter, when these cannot be obtained elsewhere, while it puts them upon their own resources to seek both, by personal industry and exertions. It is stated in the Report, and we hear it repeated in numerous quarters, that the Irish labourer does not require to be put on his own resources; that he is most anxious to work from sunrise to sunset, for a bare sufficiency of the meanest and poorest food, and, consequently, that he is always on the look-out for opportunities of turning his labour to advantage, without the stimulus of a workhouse. This is all true, with respect to the ~~actual~~ present condition of our peasantry; but, at the same time, there is a reckless improvidence belonging to their character, which tends to aggravate the sufferings of the most helpless, and to repress the spirit of constant and persevering exertion, by which alone men surrounded with great difficulties may hope to extricate themselves. We are quite sure, that this habit of mind is produced in our poor countrymen by the generally insurmountable nature of the difficulties in which they are involved, and that it occupies the place of that sullen despondency, which, in similar circumstances, would oppress the minds of a less patient or less light-hearted people. But it exists; and though it is, on many accounts, infinitely preferable to the gloomy disposition which precludes exertion, it certainly produces much mischief. It is

different, it is true, in its effects upon the animal spirits; yet it operates, equally with despair, in shutting out hope, that great stimulant to industry, and in clouding the prospect of to-morrow, (if they ever look so far before them) with the same dark fortune, which overshadows to-day. Hence, they live *de die in diem*; not exactly waiting upon Providence, but throwing themselves heedlessly upon its care; while the idea of husbanding the advantages, or profiting by the occasions, of the passing moment, is never entertained.

It may be thought that such a disposition would be rather fostered than discountenanced, by opening a refuge for the tkriftless in the workhouse. And so it would, if a door of hope, affording a glimpse, however faint and distant, of independence, through profitable employment, were not opened to them, at the same time. If, indeed, the relief thus afforded should have the effect, on the one hand, of giving the labouring class a relish for the sort of life which they would lead in those asylums, or, on the other hand, of forcing such numbers into artificial and useless employment, as to lessen the price of labour below its present miserable standard, the workhouses would be crowded beyond all calculation; and the high estimates of the Commissioners, for the charge of erecting and maintaining them, would no longer be liable to censure, as excessive or extravagant.

But it has not been proposed that the workhouse should be made so pleasant an abode, as to tempt any one to come to it, or to stay in it, unless under the constraint of strong necessity. Food it should supply, and covering, and shelter from the cold; but little they know of the spirit of an Irish peasant, who suppose that he would willingly accept these, in exchange for the unquestioned freedom of his movements. Among the restraints of *the Coercion Act*, none were found more generally irksome and intolerable, than that which compelled every man to keep within doors from an hour after sunset, until day-light on the following morning. Yet that was only a confinement to their own houses and in the society of their families: and how much more distressing, therefore, would it be, to be shut up under the eye and voice of a master clothed with authority over them, and necessarily controlling their movements every hour of the day and night?

No exemption from toil could reconcile the Irish labourer, for any lengthened period, to such a species of duress: extreme want and emergency alone could induce him to submit to it, even for a short time. Still, as we have already intimated, he is not so rash and impatient, as to reject relief altogether, on account of its disagreeable concomitants, when it is made plain to that shrewd judgment which he possesses, that the tendency of the

measure is, to secure him against being abandoned to chance and his own unaided resources, for the means of subsistence: and, therefore, if, on the one hand, it appears not unlikely that he will sadly accept that provision, as a medicine, bitter indeed, but wholesome; on the other, it appears equally clear, that he will not resort to it for the purposes of indolence, nor consent to remain in it longer than necessity shall compel him. He will go there because employment, such as he can live by, cannot be obtained: he will leave it the moment it can—not sooner; and thus the workhouse will prove the true “Board of Improvement” after all.

Mr. Revans is of opinion, that there should be, in every district of a hundred square miles, a workhouse capable of receiving 200 inmates: thus placing an asylum within a distance of five miles of every person in Ireland. The area of Ireland will give 500 such districts; so that he would have that number of houses, at a cost which he estimates under £2000 for each. This would not amount altogether to a million, instead of the four millions, at which the Commissioners of Poor Inquiry rate the cost of the buildings.

We do not think it would be advisable to have so many distinct buildings. The expense both of providing, and afterwards of maintaining, them, would be considerably less, if the distances were doubled, and a house capable of accommodating, let us say, eight hundred persons, were provided for every space of four hundred square miles. A house of this description could be substantially constructed for £7000; and a saving of, at least, two-thirds, would be effected in the permanent charges for management, besides a considerable proportional reduction in the expenditure for maintaining the pauper inmates. The only good reason assigned by Mr. Revans, for having the houses so near to each other as ten miles, is, to take away an excuse for vagrancy, which he thinks would exist, if they were much further apart. For, in that case, “a person, feigning great fatigue, sickness, infirmity, or a woman having young children with her, would certainly obtain alms, as it would be cruel to refuse relief, when those who seek it are evidently incapable of reaching an asylum.” That inconvenience, however, might be easily remedied, by giving a power to Churchwardens or Magistrates, in the remote parts of a district, to hire a proper vehicle, for conveying to the asylum all persons requiring such assistance—the owner of the vehicle to be paid by an order on the master of the workhouse.

The means of constructing these buildings should be supplied, in the first instance, by advances out of the Consolidated Fund, to be repaid by the several counties, according to the usual

course, without interest, and by instalments of five per cent., until all be returned. It is supposed that a sum of £700,000 would be sufficient to defray the building expenses, the repayment of which, in annual payments of five per cent. would be £35,000, for 20 years, being little more than £1000 a-year, during that period, upon each of the thirty-two counties, into which Ireland is divided.

With respect to the charge of maintaining them, the amount, of course, must depend on the number of poor persons who would apply for admission; and would vary considerably in different places, and at different times. There is, however, even in the present state of things, an average employment for the whole of the labourers in Ireland, of about twenty-two weeks, of six working days each.\* During so much of the year, then, it is fair to suppose, that the workhouses will be universally untenanted by able-bodied poor; and Mr. Revans calculates, that, "if the food given in the houses of refuge be not far better than that which is ordinarily possessed by the peasantry, the whole of the houses, in the counties forming the east coast, from Antrim to Waterford, will, during the greater portion of the year, contain only widows, orphans, aged persons, and now and then a few ejected tenants, or labourers who cannot obtain employment."

The quality of the food, provided for the poor in the Houses of Refuge, need not be "far better than that ordinarily possessed" by persons in their rank of life. In England, the paupers are dieted on wheaten bread, with meat once or twice a week, and soup at other times. It would be absurd to introduce such fare into an Irish workhouse, which would be better, not only than their usual diet, but than the customary fare at the tables of those who are reputed "strong farmers." But we would not recommend a niggardly or mean dispensation of food, which would be alike injurious to the effect designed by the establishment of these institutions, and unjust towards the poor persons who were reduced to the misfortune of seeking relief within their walls. A popular aversion to the workhouse would be just as mischievous a sentiment, as too great a relish and enjoyment of its hospitality. For it is most essential to the effective working of a Poor Law, that the poor themselves shall feel assured that it was meant for their benefit; and they can hardly entertain such a confidence, if they are treated with unnecessary rigour or parsimony. Their situation, in the liberal custody of the Board of Guardians, should, therefore, be rendered as comfortable as might be found compatible with the great object of promoting a love of indepen-

In Connaught, the average is short of sixteen weeks.

dence, and a willingness to exert themselves in order to obtain it. They should not be supplied with tea, or other things which are accounted luxuries among them; but of simple and wholesome food let them have enough. •

The expense of maintaining a pauper in the Mendicity Institution of Dublin, is 2½d. per day; and the Commissioners have made their calculations at the same rate, for the support of every pauper, who might require to be maintained in an asylum in any part of Ireland: so that the support of a labourer's family, at the low average of five persons, would stand the community in 7s. 3½d. per week. This is evidently a most exaggerated estimate. Mr. Revans is much nearer the mark when he says, that, where numbers were fed together, it might be done at sixpence a week for each person. In fact, he shows, that, in England, where provisions of every kind are so much dearer, and the quality of food supplied so far superior to any thing contemplated for Ireland, a shilling, and a fraction of a penny, is the average cost of maintaining a pauper in a workhouse. Assuming, then, that sixpence a-week will be sufficient for the same purpose in Ireland, and that the number of able-bodied claimants on the public bounty, including their families, will on no occasion exceed 400,000, he demonstrates, that £500,000 would be sufficient to support all these through the whole period of the year. •

Our next question is, Where is this sum, this annual supply for the relief of the poor, to come from? If, as has been computed, the land now contributes upwards of a million annually for the relief of the poor, it seems no great hardship, to require from it about half that amount in a regular shape; and we would suggest, accordingly, that each district of a workhouse, containing, as we have proposed, 400 square miles, be assessed for the support of its own poor within that asylum.

Objections, we know, have been raised to *local taxation*, for such a purpose. The benefit proposed is general, the burden is partial or unequal. To suppress vagrancy, and to put down agrarian outrage, are not more the interest of the disorderly and impoverished districts, than of those which are peaceful and prosperous: •

“ Nam tua res agitur, paries cum proximo ardet.”

A general rate is therefore spoken of. But if it be one of the most important effects, expected to result from a compulsory Poor Law, that it shall stimulate the rich to find ways and means of employing the labouring class, so that they shall come as little as possible upon the public for relief, that end would be entirely frustrated by the imposition of a general rate. For men



would feel as little disposed to spare a fund, raised by common assessment, as if it were paid from the Concordatum, or the Civil List. The weight of it, indeed, would press upon the owners of property, and it would still become heavier upon each individual, as universal abuse increased. But no man would find his own case the better for his individual attempts to lighten the pressure. The only effect of his doing so, would be to double the load upon himself; whereas, by making the rate local, the owners of property would have a direct interest in every guinea they could save; and this would dispose them not only to abstain from jobbing, for the gratification of private objects, but also to correct and control such practices in their neighbours.

How, then, is this local taxation to be apportioned? If, in any district, there be a landlord, whose tenants are all in comfort and independence, and who gives extensive and constant employment to the labouring class, is *he* to be assessed equally with the proprietor of the neighbouring estate, a spendthrift perhaps, or a miser, whose neglect of his people may have brought the whole district into distress and poverty? An estate, if it be of any considerable extent, so mismanaged as many estates in Ireland have been, not only breeds paupers to prey on its own vitals, but sends them forth in all directions, to infect and oppress its wholesome neighbours. Nay, it frequently happens, that the property of the improvident or hard-hearted landlord has fewer paupers residing upon it, than that of a benevolent and judicious proprietor in the same district. What is to be done in such a case? Is the man, who has starved them out, to escape, and the whole burden of maintaining them to light upon the good Samaritan, who has suffered them to take shelter within his confines?

Again:—Many estates have been “cleared” of the redundant population, without the slightest regard to the fate of the wretches who have been swept away. Are not those outcasts now swelling the ranks of the destitute; and shall they, who reduced them to that condition, profit by the cruelty they have practised, or escape from a share of the burden which they have laid upon the community? Mr. Bicheno, one of the Commissioners, who cannot be charged with forgetting the interests of the landlords, states, and we know it to be true in more instances than one, that—*“The prospect of a Poor Law has already been made a plea for dispossessing many of the poor.”* He makes this an argument against any Poor Law, “lest it should furnish an excuse for ejectment:” and it *would* furnish an excuse, and an inducement too, if such acts were allowed to constitute a plea for exemption from maintaining the poor. That would be at once to confer a reward upon bad landlords, for having deliberately added to the

prevailing poverty and distress, and to offer an encouragement to others to act in a similar manner.

It will doubtless be a grievous thing to force those proprietors, who have always done their duty towards their tenantry, to contribute in equal proportion to repair the mischief, which might have been avoided if others had followed their example. But when society has been reduced to an unsound condition through long mismanagement, and efforts are to be made to restore it, it is not often possible for legislation to discriminate between the evil and the good; and particularly so, when the consequences of the former are inseparably intermixed and wrought through its whole frame and texture. Legislation must, in this case, stand still and attempt nothing, or else comprehend all property alike in the obligations which it is about to impose. For no method of exactly apportioning the burthen to the deserts of those, who must bear it, can be contrived; and the injustice, that would be inflicted by the attempt, would far surpass that which must be tolerated, if the weight were laid equally upon all.

Nor is the hardship of this a new thing. The good landlords are now taxed, and oppressively taxed, for the misconduct of the bad. The heavy and expensive police establishment, which they must assess themselves to support, the large army which their contributions to the indirect taxes help to keep up, for the suppression of discontent in Ireland, and the amount of ill-regulated and misapplied benefactions lavished by the farmers upon the vagrant poor, which are so many drains from the wealth and substance of the land—all these are actual imposts laid upon good landlords, on account of the wasteful, thoughtless, and unfeeling habits of other proprietors. Should the operation of a Poor Law tend to remove or diminish these burthens—as it certainly will, if its provisions be framed on a sufficiently liberal and comprehensive plan—the necessity of supporting the improvidence of others will no longer exist in the same degree; and thus the assistance, which a good landlord may be now required to render for the relief of the unfortunate, will operate in the end, as a positive relief to himself.

*Local taxation*, we are told, necessarily implies *Settlement*. We cannot see the necessary connexion between them; and if we thought that one must follow the other, we would at once give up local taxation, and consent to a general rate, as a lesser evil than that of Settlement. The abuses and iniquities which flowed upon England out of the maladministration of the Poor Laws, before they were amended, arose from this principle, combined with that of out-door relief, and parochial employment. To it, as to the fabulous bed of the tyrant, the circumstances and ne-

cessities of each parish were required to enlarge or contract themselves, with a rigour which was quite preposterous, and of which the disastrous effects are illustrated in the famous case, already alluded to, of Cholesbury. The constant struggle between the ratepayer and the pauper, in the efforts of one to prevent, and the other to obtain, a settlement, produced ill-will, fraud, and artifices, destructive to the moral character of the people. Endless litigation ensued between parishes; the spirit of provident industry was repressed and discountenanced; undeserved hardship and vexation were practised towards the poor, and all this through the operation of this unwise law. It has been retained, as a part of the amended Poor Law,—for what good reason we cannot exactly discern: although, by the abolition of out-door relief, it is deprived of much of its power to do harm. But it is a very different thing to retain an established usage in a community, where it has long existed, and become in some degree, perhaps, interwoven with the popular habits, and to adopt it, *as a new principle*, in a country where it would be alike repugnant to the tastes and customs, and incompatible with the productive pursuits and resources, of the people.

By interfering with the distribution of labour, according to the demand, Settlement has been found very injurious in various parts of England, and has produced many of those instances of discouragement to frugality and foresight, which we have latterly heard cited against the principle of any Poor Law. There are two instances, mentioned in Mr. Chadwick's Report, of good workmen having, from their wages and by other means, saved enough to give them a prospect of independence. One of them had put by £70, and had, besides, two cows and a number of pigs. The other had two cows, a well furnished house, a pig, and some fowls. Their employer, having no farther need of their services, discharged them; and, although they were both excellent workmen, they found it impossible to procure employment. Through a desire, on the part of the ratepayers, to keep down assessment, "paupers were preferred to these men, and they could only qualify themselves for employment by becoming paupers themselves." They would have sought work elsewhere, but were not allowed to go into any other parish, lest they should gain a settlement there. We mention these cases thus particularly, because similar ones have been brought forward for the purpose of exciting a popular opposition to a Poor Law, when, in truth, they only furnish arguments against the principle of Settlement, a principle which no person, at all acquainted with the customs and necessities of the people, could ever think of proposing in a system of Poor Relief for Ireland. Migration is

indispensable for the subsistence of a large portion of our population; it is no less so, at particular seasons, for the most important and necessary operations of husbandry; and it would therefore be the greatest cruelty and folly to impose restrictions upon it.

The three Commissioners who dissent from their brethren, as to the voluntary system of relief recommended in the Report, state, as one of their grounds of opposition, that it would introduce the System of Settlement; "and we confess," they add, "we cannot contemplate any modification of that system, which could possibly lead to the curtailment of the privilege of free migration, hitherto enjoyed by the Irish poor,—a privilege, which the evidence of a former Report, proves to have afforded not only a means of support to the industrious labourer, but the only hope of existence to a class too numerous, and too virtuous, not to be objects of the deepest interest to every benevolent mind."

But how, if there is to be no such thing as parochial or district settlement, are certain districts, possessing peculiar local attractions for the poor, to be protected against an influx of pauper strangers, to prey upon the rate-payers of those districts? To this we answer, that a poor labourer can have no inducement to quit his native place for another, where he is unknown, besides the hope of procuring better employment, or better gratuitous support, than he can obtain at home. He has a right to go in quest of employment, wherever it may be had; and as long as he can obtain it, and hold it, his migration imposes no burthen upon any one. With respect to gratuitous support, no man need leave his home for that, after the general establishment of workhouses; because it will be had in his own neighbourhood, as good, and as plentiful, as at any other place. Consequently, if the labourer travels from home, he will travel in search of work; nor is it likely that he will take up his residence in any quarter where work does not abound. Should it occur, however, that, in consequence of an extraordinary temporary demand for labour, a number of strangers are induced to settle in some particular locality, to which they may afterwards become burdensome, for want of continued employment, then *emigration*, at the public charge, should be resorted to, and relief be thus afforded both to the paupers and to the portion of the community made chargeable with their support.

It would be also very necessary, in the absence of a *Settlement Clause*, to adopt strict and effective measures for the suppression of vagrancy; and, therefore, the suggestions of the Report on that head, are entitled to serious consideration. Vigorous means should certainly be taken to prevent squatters and trampers

from settling themselves upon the industrious: and if nothing else could produce that effect, it would be, perfectly just and proper to send them out of the country.\*

It would materially facilitate the introduction of a system of poor-relief into Ireland, and assist in setting its new machinery in motion, without any sudden or violent concussion, if it were accompanied at the outset by the commencement of some great and extensive public work; a work, we mean, of national concern, and of such magnitude, as to give profitable employment to large numbers of the people, during three or four years, at least, after the Poor Law came into operation. If the undertaking were such as would admit of its extending itself over many parts of the country at the same time, so as not to draw together large masses of the labouring population to any one point, this would be a great recommendation: and it would also be a most favourable circumstance if the labour, demanded for this purpose, should be employed in the direction of the most populous, the most distressed, and the least civilized, counties of Ireland.

Several projects, such as we describe, are now undergoing examination before a Royal Commission, and there can be little doubt, that some one of them will receive legislative sanction in the ensuing session of Parliament. The reader will have anticipated that we speak of the proposals for a railway, across Ireland to a Western Port. The ulterior object of that undertaking is so important to Great Britain, in its bearing upon her national and commercial relations with America, that the work should not be left to private hands alone to carry it on. It involves, in no slight degree, the future interests, and, therefore, demands the immediate care and support, of this great nation: nor can we suppose that the task of perfecting such a work will be left to depend upon individual enterprise and speculation. The nation will surely become a party in the project; and that being the case, nothing can be more obvious, or more easy, than to render it subsidiary, in the first instance, to a legislative provision for the labouring poor. Regulations may be framed to oblige the conductors of the Western Railway, and the Commissioners of Poor Laws, to render mutual assistance to each other; the former being bound to employ, in every possible instance, the able-bodied poor now out of work; and the latter to supply them with workmen from those districts where the market of labour is most over-

---

\* We would include, in the same category with the unknown vagrant, all incurable drunkards, whether known or not, who, by a determined indulgence of their favourite vice, should have rendered themselves burdensome to the community. Such a regulation would go farther, than any possible restrictions upon publicans, to reform this degrading source of misery.

stocked. By such an arrangement, the pressure upon very necessitous districts may be much alleviated; and by the time that it shall cease to have effect, there will be other sources of industry opened, or the means devised for the relief of the poor will be more matured, and the whole country, we doubt not, in a better condition to support them.

It affords us sincere gratification to be assured, and to be enabled to assure the friends of Ireland, that the principal members of His Majesty's Government are disposed to give their most strenuous support to this cause, which is, in fact, the cause of humanity and of justice. Lord Morpeth, whose attachment to Ireland retains all the fervour and sincerity of a first affection, is pledged to bring forward a measure for the relief of our poor. They could not have placed themselves under a better or a kinder patron. For he knows the country and its resources,—he knows what the poor have a right to expect, and what the affluent are able, and may be justly required, to contribute: nor does the House of Commons contain any one better qualified to plead a cause, which, if urged with sufficient warmth and without exaggeration, must meet an advocate in every just, manly, and generous bosom. The Government, *we hope*, is unanimous in its determination to give a cordial and energetic support to the act of the Secretary for Ireland. The *hearts* of the leading and influential members of the Cabinet are with us, upon this question; and if there be, amongst the usual supporters of the Government, any who entertain an opposite feeling, whatever deference may be due to their opinions, on other subjects, we trust it is unnecessary to warn Lord Melbourne against their arguments and representations upon this. Of his own disposition to take a large and generous view of it, we have not the slightest doubt. That belongs to his character, and to the anxiety he has always evinced to promote the permanent good of Ireland: and when he finds the sentiment confirmed, as we know it will be, by Lord John Russell, "*The Secretary of State for Ireland*,"—the ardent and tried friend of our land, the protector and the advocate of oppressed and suffering humanity in every clime and country,—he will not hesitate to follow its bias. If he needs any further confirmation of the impulse, let him consult Lord Lansdowne, whose opinion, as the proprietor of extensive and well-managed estates in Ireland, is entitled to much deference. We are quite sure that *he* will warmly support a Poor Law. Let him ask Lord Duncannon, whose Irish tenantry, down to the lowest peasant, present, in their flourishing and happy condition, the strongest living argument *against* a Poor Law. For, on that nobleman's property, not only is pauperism unknown, but the condition of the labourer is raised far above the ordinary

standard of the Irish peasantry. In point of lodging, of comfort, of cleanliness, of dress, of food, and of education, there is an obvious and marked superiority; and all this has been effected, without the use of stimulants of any kind, either in the shape of high wages or of premiums, by a steady course of judicious encouragement and superintendence. If any man has a good right to oppose a Poor Law, it is Lord Duncannon; for he can show, by the stubborn evidence of facts, how easily the peasantry of Ireland *might be* raised above the want of legislative relief, if all landlords were as wise, as persevering, and as kind as he is. Yet let Lord Melbourne consult Lord Duncannon; and he will tell him—although the measure may and will inflict unmerited taxation upon himself—that the general condition of the poor of Ireland cries aloud for relief, and will not brook a longer delay. Let him consult the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, who, though he possesses no property in the country, is better acquainted with its actual condition, and has a far clearer and more comprehensive knowledge of the resources and necessities of its population, than numbers of titled and untitled personages who derive large revenues from the soil:—he will tell him that a Poor Law is indispensable, not only as an act of justice to Ireland, but one of safety and protection to Great Britain; that it is not more to be desired as a relief to a noble and long suffering people, than as a requisite support to the authority of the laws, and a security and consolidation to that Bond of Union which holds the several parts of this great empire together.\* Let him read the evidence taken before the Assistant Commissioners, and *that* will tell him that there is no help, no hope, in anything short of legal compulsion, to rescue two millions of his fellow-subjects out of a state of degradation and misery scarcely conceivable. Let him trust his own excellent understanding and right feeling; but let him pay no attention to the opposition of interested and narrow-minded men.

The Commissioners, at the conclusion of their Report, say,—*“What ought to be done, we trust will be done.”* It is a good and an honest wish, to which we and “all the people” answer with a hearty “Amen.” This “ought to be done, and we trust

---

\* Lord Stanley, whose example as a landlord we earnestly commend to the imitation of those who admire his more flashy qualities, is, we believe a sincere advocate for a Poor Law. We know not if he would go farther than the Commissioners. But we should expect, from the very judicious and praiseworthy management of his property in Tipperary, that he would, upon this question, take a manly and decided course; and, indeed, we shall be greatly disappointed if he does not. With respect to the treatment of his Irish tenantry, he has always been consistent, generous, and wise.

it will be done," *quickly*. Another session must not pass over without a provision being made for our suffering, neglected, patient, countrymen. The harrassing opposition, with which the Government has been thwarted and perplexed, during the two last sessions of Parliament, is an excuse for many unfulfilled pledges and duties. Whether they will again encounter the same vexatious resistance to their general policy, or whether the country is prepared to endure the third act of a farce, now grown too tedious to be amusing, we cannot venture to predict. But, in any case, this measure should be amongst the first, as it is decidedly the most important, which will try the pulse of the House of Lords in the next session. If they reject it, they will have only added *a log to the pile*. If they suffer it to pass, the Government will have a glorious answer to the impudent and jeering question of the Tories, "What have you done?" For they can appeal to this enduring monument of their zeal for the good of all classes of persons, and say,—“We have done justice, and laid the foundation of peace: we have given a Poor Law to Ireland.”

---

ART. IV.—*The Progress of the Nation, in its various Social and Economical Relations, from the beginning of the Nineteenth Century to the Present time.* By G. R. Porter, Esq. 8vo. London. 1836.

WE are not able precisely to assign the period when statistical knowledge began to be appreciated, or when it first assumed the form of a distinct branch of science; but it may fairly be assumed, that it owed its origin to the establishment of mortuary and baptismal registers, at the beginning of the 17th century.\* Captain John Graunt, of London, has the honour of having first led the way in this species of investigation; and it must be confessed, that his "*Natural and Political Observations on Bills of Mortality*," evince a singular talent for observation in this field of enquiry, where, previously to his own, few footsteps are to be traced. In 1722, followed the "*Göttliche Ordnung*" of Süssmilch; and, in 1783, the celebrated "*Observations on Reversionary Payments*" of Dr. Price.

---

\* Good Mortuary Tables, however, were preserved at Geneva from so early a period as 1560, and the example thus set was soon imitated by the German States. Parish registers were first enjoined to be kept in this country in 1538, on the dissolution of the monasteries. The first bills of mortality for London were issued in 1603, in consequence of the ravages of the plague; but the Decennial Population Acts did not come into operation till March 1801.



These jejune and apparently unproductive researches were speedily followed by a rich harvest of results, as important as they were unexpected, and immediately bearing on the best interests of society. Among these may be reckoned, as not the least important, the formation of benefit societies among the poor, and those gigantic monied confederacies, the insurance companies, among the rich; the value of which, in a commercial and political point of view, it is scarcely possible to estimate too highly. Our business, however, at present, is neither with these, nor with the various other applications of statistics, which constitute modern political economy: our object is confined to the investigation of the state of Public Health, and of the causes which have contributed to its gradual improvement.

It may not be out of place to remark one very gratifying truth, disclosed to us by all the bearings of this subject, viz. that the moral and physical condition of this country has kept, and is still keeping, a steady onward progress towards social perfection. Under whatever aspect the question is regarded, unequivocal traces are every where visible of the influence of associated wealth and education, in checking crime, and diminishing the amount of mortality. The application of the same test gives us also, the only tangible proof of the relative degrees of prosperity of different countries, and of the relative superiority, especially, of this country over every other. From the facts, which will be laid before the reader, it will be impossible, we think, to escape this inference, or to avoid the conclusion, that a great part of this beneficial change is attributable entirely to the improvements of medical art, which has more than kept pace with the progress of general science.

There are several points of view in which the diminished rate of mortality is capable of being represented. In the 3d century, the expectation of life, or, what amounts to the same thing, the mean duration of life, for free citizens, did not exceed 30 years, but in Britain, at the present time, it extends, at least, to 50 years. The mean duration of life of a native of Geneva, in the middle of the 16th century, was only 18 years; and half the children born did not reach their sixth year: but, at present, the expectation of life, calculated for the whole population of Geneva, is, at least, 36 years,\* and half the children born attain their 28th year, showing, in the former point of view, a double, and in the latter, a quintuple, rate of improvement. Facts, which we shall presently have occasion to state, evince a corresponding rate of amendment in this country.

The estimated proportion of deaths in this country, for the last half century, indicates a continually diminishing mortality, which can only be ascribed to some steadily operative cause.

Thus, in 1786, the rate of mortality, for the whole of England and Wales, was 1 in 42; in 1801, 1 in 47; in 1831, it had diminished to 1 in 58,—shewing an improvement of 38 per cent. in the short period of half a century. The annual mortality of the county of Middlesex, which, in the beginning of the last century, was estimated at 1 in 25, had fallen to 1 in 35 in 1801; and, at present, does not exceed 1 in 45. A corresponding improvement is visible in our urban population. In London, for example, the number of deaths diminished, from 21,000 in 1697, to 17,000, in 1797; showing not only a comparative, but an absolute, decrease of mortality, in regard to the preceding century. The same fact is also observable in regard to the present century; the number of deaths being less numerous, by 3000, in 1826, than they were in 1766, although the population had very nearly doubled itself during that period. From 1720 to 1750, the mortality of London was estimated at 1 in 20; at present, it has decreased to 1 in 46, a rate much more favourable than that for the whole of France, and materially less than the known rate of mortality for any other city in Europe. Manchester has more than quadrupled its inhabitants since the middle of the last century; but, notwithstanding this, the mortality has declined, from 1 to 25, to 1 in 50, or exactly one half.

This improvement is more or less conspicuous in most of the European states or cities, but in a far inferior degree to what appears in Great Britain; for, notwithstanding that it has long been the fashion to exhaust every term of reproach on our variable climate, and particularly on the fogs and smoke of London, it would yet appear, that the most favoured spots on the continent are not comparable to either in regard to salubrity;—nay, the very places which have long been selected as the resort of invalids, and celebrated as the fountains of health, are, in fact, far more fatal to life than our great metropolis. The following table conveys a pregnant hint to those who consider a foreign climate preferable to our own for the restoration of health.

*Mortality of Countries.*

Russia	-	-	1 in 26
The Venetian States	- . .	- .	1 in 28
The whole of New Spain	-	-	1 in 30
The two Sicilies	-	-	1 in 31
Wurtemberg	-	-	1 in 33
Naples	- .	-	1 in 34
The United States, and France	-	- .	1 in 40
Sweden	- .	-	1 in 41
Holland	-	-	1 in 48
Pays de Vaud	- .	-	1 in 49
Norway	-	-	1 in 54
England and Wales	-	-	1 in 60

*Mortality of Cities.*

Vienna	-	-	-	1 in 22½
Amsterdam	-	-	-	1 in 24
Rome and Brussels	-	-	-	1 in 25
Naples	-	-	-	1 in 28
Madrid	-	-	-	1 in 29
Nice	-	-	-	1 in 31
Paris, Strasbourg, Barcelona, and Lyons	-	-	-	1 in 32
Berlin	-	-	-	1 in 34
Leghorn	-	-	-	1 in 35
Liverpool	-	-	-	1 in 40
London	-	-	-	1 in 46
Manchester	-	-	-	1 in 50

"It is indisputable," Dr. Hawkins observes, "that the average proportion of deaths in England, and her cities, is less than that of any other city in Europe: and it may be added, that the powers of body and mind are preserved, to a late period, in higher perfection here, than in other countries. Nowhere are the advances of age so slowly perceived, and nowhere so little manifested on the exterior."\* It may be added, that the mortality of the continental cities would be greatly augmented but for their public hospitals. Dupin estimated that half the population of Paris died in the public hospitals, and other asylums of charity.

To what, then, are we to attribute this increase in the value of human life, on the one hand, and these varying rates of mortality, on the other? There can be no doubt that it depends on a concurrence of causes which more or less directly emanate from increased wealth and civilization. These may fairly enough be divided into general and medical.

Among the general causes, the amelioration of climate, by cultivation and surface drainage, must hold a principal rank. These tend to banish two of the most formidable enemies to health and longevity, viz. cold and moisture. These causes operate principally on the young, particularly those in a state of infancy, and derive much of their force from being united with poverty. Now, it is precisely among this section of the population that the decline of mortality has been principally exhibited. Within the last half century, the mortality of those under 20 years of age has diminished, from 1 in 76½, to 1 in 137, or nearly one half, this calculation being made in reference to the whole population. In some of the public schools, a very low rate of mortality

---

\* *Elements of Medical Statistics*, 8vo. Lond. 1823, a work of singular merit, and doing equal credit to the head and heart of the amiable author.

exists, which may partly be attributed to a plenty of good clothing and food, and partly to the fact, that parents will only send those children that happen to be strong. At the Edinburgh High School, for example, the annual mortality has not exceeded 1 in 833, which is considerably less than the annual minimum mortality, (.51 per cent.) from 10 to 15 years of age, for the whole of England and Wales. In reference to the small number of deaths which have occurred at Christ's Hospital, from 1829 to 1833, viz. 1 in 157½, Dr. Mitchell, in the *Factory Report*, justly observes, that it is to "substantial clothing, and an abundance of wholesome food, healthful exercise in the hours allowed for recreation, and immediate attention to the first appearance of sickness, under skilful medical men," that we must attribute this result.

Another very influential cause of improved health, arises from increased commercial and agricultural prosperity, which must not only multiply the comforts of the poorer classes, in the three essential articles of food, clothing, and habitation, but, by exhilarating the mind with cheerfulness and hope, call its best energies into wholesome operation. The influence of depraved or defective food, in checking the encrease of population, and swelling the bills of mortality, was rendered but too manifest by the bad crops of 1795 and 1800; while the effects of despondency on the body, or of the *morale* on the *physique*, scarcely require any formal proof. Surgeons have long been aware of the hazard of performing any capital surgical operations on patients labouring under mental depression; and it has been observed, that the greatest difference exists in the consequences of disease, as it happens to affect a retreating or an advancing army;—the constitution, which in the one case triumphs over incredible difficulties, succumbing in the other, without a struggle, under the merest trifles. It may be observed, too, that epidemics are in general the offspring of misery and want, and exhaust their principal fury on the lower classes.

On the contrary, the conservative tendency of an easy and affluent condition is remarkably exemplified in the low rate of mortality among those who have insured at the Equitable Office. From the year 1800 to 1821, it did not exceed 1 in 81. At the University Club, for a space of three years, it did not exceed 1 in 90. Now, if this be contrasted with the mortality among the West India slaves, we shall obtain some idea of the immense protection which wealth brings with it to the body. The mortality among these was formerly as great as 1 in 6: in 1829 it had diminished to 1 in 16, and of the free Africans to 1 in 33. The lower rate of mortality among the free Africans, shows that it did not depend on climate,

transplantation, or any other general cause operating alike upon the whole race. The children of the poor in France die in the proportion of at least two to one of those in affluent circumstances; and the same difference is observable between the abject and the opulent, among the adult population, occupying the extreme localities of Paris. In a recent number of the *Annales d'Hygiène Publique*, tom. xiv. p. 88, M. Lombard has given an analysis of 8,488 men of 16 years of age and upwards, inscribed in the mortuary registers of Geneva from 1796 to 1830, from which it appears that these persons attained a mean life of 55 years, while the two extremes of the scale were as far apart as 69.1 on the one hand, and 44.3 on the other. Magistrates, *rentiers*, and Protestant ecclesiastics, attained the mean life respectively of 69.1, 65.8, and 63.8 years; but enamellers, locksmiths, and painters, only 48.7, 47.2 and 44.3 years; the number for agriculturists (44.7) representing very nearly the mean term. M. Lombard, in short, comes to the conclusion that a state of competence, as opposed to that of distress, is calculated to prolong life at least seven years and a half; and an active life, as opposed to a sedentary, as much as one year and four-tenths,—making together a difference of nearly nine years in the life of such persons. One fearful cause of mortality in this country is scrophula, in its hundred different forms; but nothing excites this disease so certainly as cold and squalid poverty, combined with insufficient nutriment and clothing. From rickets alone (which is a species of scrophula), the annual number of deaths within the Bills of Mortality seldom averaged less than 380 up to the beginning of the 17th century. Towards the middle of this century, however, they had diminished to 11, and towards the end of it to 1.

There are a number of other circumstances, connected with our economic relations, which materially contribute to promote the public health; and so far to confirm the remark of the discerning Sydenham, that “*Morbi acuti Deum habent autorem, chronici ipsos nos* :” as, for example, an abundant supply of wholesome water, an efficient system of drainage, a general taste for cleanliness, enforced, where it becomes necessary, by wholesome municipal authority, the less crowded state of our private dwellings, the better economy of our hospitals, a more commodious system of public building, combining the advantages of space and ventilation with internal conveniences, a plenty of good wheaten bread, and the use of frequent changes of linen next the skin, in the room of sordid and filthy woollen. Mr. White, in reference to the extinction of leprosy, and, indeed, of most of those other frightful epidemics, which have at one time or another

desolated this country, very ably sums up the causes of this happy change. "This," he says, "may have originated; and been continued, from the much smaller quantity of salted meat and fish now eaten in these kingdoms—from the use of linen next the skin—from the plenty of better bread—and from the profusion of fruits, roots, legumes and greens, so common in every family. Three or four centuries ago, before there were any enclosures, sown-grasses, field-turnips, field-carrots, or hay, all the cattle, that had grown fat in summer, and were not killed for winter use, were turned out, soon after Michaelmas, to shift as they could through the dead months; so that *no fresh meat could be had in the winter or spring.*"—*Nat. Hist. of Selborne.*

The precise change of habits, referred to in the above extract, does not, of course, apply to the improved and still improving condition of the lower orders, during the present century. It is, however, to the same *class* of agencies, which formerly produced epidemical and malignant disorders\*, that we must still refer the superior mortality of one town over another, or of one period of time above another. We shall conclude this branch of the subject with one farther extract from Dr. Hawkins:—

"So intimate a connection subsists between political changes and the public health, that wherever feudal distinctions have been abolished, wherever the artisan or the peasant has been released from arbitrary enactments, there also the life of these classes has acquired a new vigour; and it is certain, that even bodily strength, and the power of enduring hardships, are divided among the natives of the earth in a proportion relative to their prosperity and civilization."

The gradual substitution of spirit for a wholesome malt liquor, and the rapid multiplication of gin palaces, must have acted as a serious counteracting circumstance to the beneficial tendencies

---

\* It is highly probable, that the same causes, acting under different circumstances of the atmosphere, produced the different epidemics of the middle centuries. The plague was the emphatic evil of those ages, and scarcely any ten years elapsed without a considerable visitation of it; but the devastation committed, in the intervals, by dysentery, scurvy, putrid fevers, and a number of other infections, was scarcely less deplorable. Of these, the sweating sickness was most nearly allied to plague, and prevailed to a dreadful extent in the years 1485, 1506, 1517, 1528, and 1551. The greatest plague years of the 17th century, were 1603, 1625, 1636, and 1665, in which the mortality is reported to have been respectively 36,000, 35,000, 10,000, and 68,000, although, according to Lord Clarendon, "many, who could compute very well, concluded there were in truth double that who died." The memorable fire of London occurred in 1666, while the plague was yet raging; and, as it has never returned since, it is reasonable to suppose, that the causes of its first appearance were entirely of a local nature. Among the signs which usually ushered it in, Diemerbroeck enumerates "*Morbi epidemici mali moris, dysenteriae valde malignae et contagiosae, et imprimis febres putridae malignissimae et purpuratae, plurimisque lethales.*" Morton, also, in speaking of the poison of the remittent fever, which prevailed for some years previous to 1665, says, "*Venenum sese recolligens, et mirum in modum auctum, hanc ουνεχην in pestem funestissimam et dirissimam inopinato mutavit.*"

before mentioned: so must also the progressive change which has latterly taken place in the relative proportions of the agricultural and manufacturing population. In 1811, these proportions were as 100 to 126, for the whole of Great Britain: in 1831 they had become as 100 to 149, or, taking the increase in the whole number of families, for these 20 years, to have been at the rate of 34 per cent, the accession to the agricultural class has only been 7½ per cent, while that to the manufacturing and trading classes has been at least 27 per cent. For the same reason, a disposition among the class of *rentiers*, or independent gentry, to centralize, or adopt a civic mode of life, in preference to the country, must have had a proportionably adverse effect on the general health.

The second general head, to which we have referred the diminished and still diminishing mortality of modern times, is the improvement of medical art. Many, perhaps, will be disposed to dispute this position; and even among the members of the profession there may be found some, who, either from a natural incapability of generalizing the effects of medicine on an extensive scale, or from an incorrigible scepticism of mind, which refuses the light of truth in any other form than that of a demonstration, will still persist in countenancing the retention of this error. Such persons are very unfit to make good physicians; they have mistaken altogether their *metier*, and should have become professors of the mathematics, or some of the more purely inductive sciences, rather than of a science which has to deal entirely with probabilities: “*Est enim hæc ars conjecturalis, neque respondet ci plerumque non solum conjectura, sed etiam experientia.*” The possession of strong natural sagacity, strengthened and directed by sound professional knowledge, is the only order of intellect which can expect to attain the first rank in the medical profession; and although it must undoubtedly be conceded, that the experienced physician often expresses doubt, in those very cases where the young are full of confidence, yet this is a discriminative doubt, arising from a more exact knowledge of disease, and consequently dictating the forbearance of experimental treatment where it probably would be hurtful.

If we were required to point out the distinguishing feature of modern medicine, we should not hesitate to affirm, that it will be found in the adoption of more just scientific principles, *in conformity* with the indications of nature.\* In the treatment of fever, for example, the physician's aim is not so much to quell the storm, for that he knows to be impossible, as to guide the vessel safely through it; and for this purpose he does not consider it necessary to thwart all the indications of nature, but lends his assisting hand to render their accomplishment more certain. If the con-

stitution labours under excessive action, he effectually relieves it by a vigorous application of the lancet; if, on the contrary, there is a prostration of the vital energies, which threatens the extinction of life, he supports it with a liberal hand—his constant endeavour is to restore the balance of action, and to relieve individual organs, when disproportionately oppressed. Modern medicine, in short, is vigorous where vigour is required, and expectant where nature alone is adequate to the cure; but, on the whole, a more decided adoption of the anti-phlogistic treatment, combined with a more just confidence in the powers of nature, may unquestionably be said to constitute the leading characteristics of the modern system.

For this change we are principally indebted to the sagacious Sydenham. "I see," said he, in reference to the small-pox, "no reason why the patient should be kept stifled in bed, but rather that he may rise and sit up, a few hours every day, provided the injuries, arising from the extremes of heat and cold, be prevented, both with respect to the place wherein he lies, and his manner of clothing." This enlistment of common sense in the cause of medicine, is not more just, than it certainly is natural. It constitutes the leading distinction between the purely theoretical and the practical physician, while it is the only sure basis on which a sound judgment of disease can at any time be formed: our only wonder is, that so prime a faculty of our nature, as common sense, and so essential to the direction of talent of every kind, should so long have remained overlaid by prejudice, or fettered by the technicalities of science.

Let us, however, descend from these generalities to some specific examples, illustrative of the improved state of the public health.

The well-educated physician can scarcely require numerical proof, that fever is more successfully treated in the present age, than it was in the last, or, indeed, in any other. Out of 37 cases treated by Hippocrates, 21, or more than one half, died; whereas, at the Fever Hospital of London, in 1825, the total mortality was less than 1 in 7; and at the Dublin Fever Hospital, from 1804 to 1812, did not exceed 1 in 12. The deaths from fever, within the Bills of Mortality, averaged about 3000 annually, in the middle of the last century, but had diminished to 2000 and under, towards the end.

One of the effects of high wrought civilization on a people, especially when conjoined with a cold climate, is to multiply chronic complaints, and to diminish the number of acute diseases: so that in India, and among uncivilized nations generally, the quantity of disease at any given period (excepting, of course,



the prevalence of epidemics) is exceedingly small. It has been estimated, that about one-twentieth of the population are constantly under illness in this country; out of which about one-twentieth are acute cases, and another twentieth surgical complaints. Now, chronic complaints are far less inimical to life than is generally believed; independently of which, physicians are now in the habit of diagnosing such cases with infinitely more caution, and of treating them with infinitely more judgment, than formerly: so that, in proportion as their resources have seemed to multiply, they have shown less disposition to employ them. Correctness of diagnosis may be regarded as one of the chief advantages arising from an extensive acquaintance with pathology, aided, as it often is, by the indications of the stethoscope.

The introduction of Vaccination, in 1798, has probably been more efficient, as a single cause, in the reduction of mortality, than any other. According to the last report of the *National Vaccine Institution*, the number of deaths from small-pox within the Bills of Mortality, for the preceding year, were only 343, or 4,000 less than the average mortality from this cause during the last century, notwithstanding the increase of the population. Thus also each successive decennary period, commencing with the present century, exhibits a gradual decline of mortality from this cause, from 73 in every 1000 deaths, in 1800, to 43 in 1810, 35 in 1820, and 23 in 1830; and not only has the number of deaths from this cause diminished, in proportion to the whole population and mortality, but in proportion also to the number of those who take the disease; for, from 1794 to 1798, the mortality, at the Small-pox Hospital of London, was 32 in 100, or nearly 1 in 3; but had diminished, in 1834, to 13 in 100, or nearly 1 in 8, a diminution which must principally be ascribed to the improved medical treatment to which the patients are subjected.

A similar decrease in the mortality of lunatic asylums and schools, especially where the same management, as to diet, &c. has been pursued, leads to the same conclusion. The mortality among the children of the Foundling Hospital, of London, under 12 years of age, for thirty years, terminating in 1799, diminished in the proportion of 12 to 7. Also at Christ's Hospital, the mortality, as we have already had occasion to observe, has exhibited a successive decrease for each quinquennial period, commencing with 1814, and terminating in 1833, from 1 in 100, to 1 in 157½, in respect to which, Mr. Porter justly observes, that "The length of time, and the numbers embraced by the returns, forbid the belief that the favourable

result is the effect of accident; and if we consider that the originally low rate of mortality has been rendered more and more favourable in each succeeding five years, it is hardly possible to account for the circumstance by any other supposition, than that of a more rational mode of discipline, both moral and medical, than was practised in former periods."

The mortality among children under 10 years of age, in the town of Warrington, (pop. 13,000), from 1772-81 to 1818-25, declined from 55 to 44½ per cent. In the Bills of Mortality for London, we have the means of tracing this decline with considerable accuracy. Thus, if we divide the century, from 1730 to 1830, into vigesimal periods, the mortality among children under 5 years of age will be found to have diminished, in each interval, from 74.5 per cent for the *first*, to 63.0 for the *second*, 51.5 for the *third*, 41.3 for the *fourth*, and 31.8 for the *last*. The minimum mortality occurs from the age of 10 to 15; the maximum from 0 to 5,—the latter being, at least, ten times greater than the former: so that we may perceive, from this, the importance of judicious management of children, especially in a medical point of view. The astounding mortality of foundlings exhibits this in a striking light. Of 10,272 children received into the Foundling Hospital of Dublin, from 1775 to 1796, 45 only were recovered; but of 2168 received from 1805 to 1806, 486 recovered. During the 34 years, comprised between 1798 to 1831 (inclusive), there were admitted 51,523 children, and of these 12,153 died immediately in the nursery; but of the remainder as many as one-third were living at their ninth year. From 1771 to 1777, 31,951 deserted children were received at the Foundling Hospital of Paris; and of these 25,476 died before the end of the first year: but in 1823, one half of those which were received, survived to the end of this period. It may be replied, that this beneficial change is probably due to the provision which has been made for sending the children into the country, under the care of intelligent and wholesome nurses,—and this is certainly true: but was not this measure first adopted at medical suggestion, and carried into effect under medical superintendence?

The next prominent fact relating to this subject, regards the fate of lying-in women. The mortality at the British Lying-in Hospital, in 1750, was 1 in 42; in 1780, 1 in 60; and finally, from 1789 to 1798, (inclusive) 1 in 288. From 1757 to 1825, the number of women dying in childbed, at the Dublin Lying-in Hospital, was 1 in 89. In 1826 to 1833, it had diminished to 1 in 100. The prevalence, however, of epidemics, at certain seasons, in lying-in hospitals, renders any selection of years a very unsafe guide, as, in some years, every patient almost escapes; while, in

others, every fourth or every sixth, that is received, becomes the victim of puerperal inflammation. Still, it cannot be doubted that a great and progressive amendment has taken place upon the whole, arising, in great measure, from the dismissal of a number of pernicious prejudices from the lying-in chamber, especially a meddling interference with nature, and the administration of heating cordials to the patient; and partly from the more judicious application of instrumental assistance in difficult cases. According to Mr. Mantell of Lewes, whose statement may be entirely depended on, only two fatal cases, out of a total of 2410, occurred in that town, from 1813 to 1828.

The number of still-born children has preserved a pretty constant proportion to the fate of the mothers, although there are some varieties in this respect which are not easily explained. The number of still-births for London is about 1 in 28, and for Paris 1 in 19. Of 16,654 births, which occurred at the Dublin Lying-in Hospital, during a period of seven years, commencing November, 1826, as many as 1121, or 1 in 14½, were still-births. These are always more frequent among the poor and sick than among the rich and healthy. At the *Hôpital des Vénériennes* at Paris, 2 out of every 7 are born dead; in a similar establishment at Hamburg 1 out of every 3. At Göttingen, the mortality among illegitimate children is, at least, five times greater than among those who are born in wedlock.

But whatever may be thought of the advances of medicine and obstetricity,—of the improvements of surgery there can be no question. Surgery, indeed, raised first from an art into a science by the genius of Hunter,\* has not only taken equal rank with the other learned professions, but has far out-stripped them in the celerity of its advances. With the exception of chemistry, no modern science has presented the same number of brilliant discoveries, or valuable practical improvements:—to name them would be to go over the whole list of surgical diseases. Some, as inflammation of the membranes of the brain, consequent on severe concussions of that organ, which were formerly exceedingly common, are now almost entirely prevented by a judicious anticipatory treatment: others, as nearly the whole class of aneurisms, which fifty years ago were left to work their fatal effects on the system without any attempt at relief being made, are now comparatively brought under the dominion of art. Compared with former years, the number of patients admitted into our public hospitals, to be cut for the stone, is exceed-

---

\* A new edition, is advertised of the works of this celebrated man in 4 volumes, 8vo, with Notes by Mr. Palmer. It is expected to be ready in a few months.

ingly limited—partly arising from the invention of Sir Astley Cooper's forceps for the extraction of small calculi from the bladder; partly from calculous diseases being better understood, and better treated at the commencement; and partly from the operation of lithotritry being occasionally had recourse to. We are of opinion that, at least, one-half of the cases of diseases of the joints, and bad compound fractures of the extremities, which were formerly condemned, are now recovered by a better treatment; and though these are certainly not very common complaints, and form therefore no very large proportion of the total mortality, they yet serve to indicate the great advances which have been made in the science, every part of which, has been equally cultivated. Nothing can exhibit this in a more striking light, than the amelioration, which has taken place in the treatment of syphilis, which now rarely presents those disgusting spectacles which were formerly so common at every turn.

The subjects of insanity and suicide are closely associated, and must not be entirely passed over. The former is the penalty of high-wrought civilization, and increases as this advances; the latter may be regarded as some index to the morality of a country, or, at all events, of the degree in which human life is estimated by it. From a comparison of different years, we gather the pleasing inference, that the mortality of our lunatic asylums has gradually lessened, in nearly the same proportion as the number of curables to incurables has gradually augmented. It appears, by nearly all the returns of Europe, excepting France, that men are more prone to insanity than females, in the proportion of 100 to 77: but this apparent discrepancy may, perhaps, be referred to the delicate feelings of relatives, who object to the idea of placing the female branches of their families in public asylums, especially as they are more easily controlled at their own homes or in private families. The proportion of females cured at the Bethlem Hospital, during the last 15 years, has been 47.0 per cent.; and at St. Luke's, 44.8 per cent.; the respective numbers for males being 39.6 and 41.3.—Of 997 curable patients, admitted at the former, from 1830 to 1834 (inclusive), considerably more than half were between the ages of 20 and 40, or, precisely at that period of life, when the passions acquire their greatest ascendancy. The mortality, during the same period, was a little less than 1 in 25, which is surprisingly small, when we consider that many of these labour under actual organic disease of a vital part. Of the recoveries, nearly one half took place within the first six months.

The opinion that religion is frequently the cause of insanity is not well supported. Count de Chabrol gives it a very low

place in the ~~scale~~ of causation, making 9 only out of 100 cases to depend upon it. Among a more reflecting people than the French, this proportion may be considered low, but it should also be borne in mind that insanity naturally seizes on the illimitable and sublime mysteries of religion, as the proper food of its dis-tempered imaginations, although these had nothing whatever to do with causing it in the first instance.

The suicidal propensity is generally regarded in this country as a resulting evidence of insanity. This arises from false motives of charity, and has a pernicious effect. The vulgar belief that Englishmen are peculiarly prone to the commission of suicide is entirely without foundation. About 100 instances, only, annually occur in the metropolis. From 1812 to 1824, the total number of suicides for the City of Westminster, was only 290, or 1 in 8,000—a proportion at least three times inferior to that for any of the great cities of France or Germany; and if allowance is made for the extreme dissipation of many parts of this city, we shall not be far wrong in considering 1 in 10,000 a medium proportion. In Prussia, the civic cases are to the rural as 14 to 4. The propensity is stronger in the male than in the female, as 5 to 2, in this country, and 2 to 1 in France. Many curious examples are recorded of the influence of imitation, in determining the thoughts to suicide, especially of those who are predisposed. The shocking recital of horrible cases in the newspapers, are attended with this effect. It has occasionally become necessary for the public authorities to interfere, and either to deny the rites of Christian burial, or to expose the corpse to some indignity, in order to arrest the progress of a suicidal contagion. Dr. Caspar relates the existence of a suicidal club in Prussia, consisting of six persons, all of whom accomplished their purpose: and a similar club is said to have existed in Paris, not long since, the members of which bound themselves by a regulation, that, every year, one of their number should be selected to destroy himself as a testimony of their sincerity. Among the causes of suicide, sheer misery holds a prominent place; next to that, domestic unhappiness; then, reverses of fortune, disappointed love, and gambling. A great number of attempted suicides arise from the loss of female honour, accompanied by the prospect of pregnancy. It is remarkable, that this disposition is far more predominant in Protestant than in Catholic communities. In Spain it is so extremely rare, that for the whole of 1826, only 16 instances were officially reported. From 1812 to 1824, the suicides committed in Westminster, in the months of June, were 34, and those in the months of November 22. In 1812, 1815, 1820, and 1824, the months of November did not afford a single case.

There are two other circumstances which deserve to be noticed,

as having an important bearing on this subject; and these are, the extension of sound medical information among the members of the profession, and the establishment of hospitals and other public institutions, as convenient means for the beneficial display of their acquirements. It is scarcely possible to judge of the state of the profession, as it existed fifty years ago, from what it is at the present time. Towards the middle of the last century, very few public lectures of any kind were given,—no regular course of study was prescribed—no regular system of dissection pursued—no examination of candidates required—every thing was left to chance, and every thing shared the common fate of chance measures. But, at present, the standard of professional education is pushed to its very utmost limits; for two full seasons, that the pupil is required to pursue a systematic study in London, his intellect is kept on the full stretch. The most dull, and the most dissipated, acquire knowledge in spite of themselves: they live in an atmosphere of knowledge, and imbibe the principles of their profession unconsciously from those around them. In the metropolis alone, there are fourteen complete schools of medicine, besides private lectures; and to these are attached eight general hospitals, which receive, on an average, 25,000 in-patients in the course of the year; besides a multitude of similar but smaller establishments, dispersed in convenient neighbourhoods through the town, which, in one way or other, administer medical relief to at least 200,000 persons annually. Such ample opportunities leave no excuse to those who still choose to be ignorant; and, in fact, few do choose to be ignorant; the pressure from without, on the one hand, and the knowledge, that they must, at the end of two years, undergo two stiff examinations, by two rival bodies, on the other, operating as a sufficient spur to industry. But, independently of these facilities in the metropolis, there are forty-seven well-appointed public hospitals in our large provincial towns, (not reckoning dispensaries) all erected within the last century, and capable of accommodating 29,898 in-patients annually, besides a proportionate number of out-patients, and to these are attached eleven complete and efficient schools of medicine, besides private unrecognised lectures.\*

---

\* We call attention to this fact, in order to point out the value of correct statistical returns from our different public charities. What would be the value or kind of inferences deducible from a judicious analysis of 90,000 in-patients, received into the general hospitals of Great Britain and Ireland, in the course of a single year, we are not able to say; but we can entertain no doubt that a series of documents of this kind, extending over several years, and accurately compiled, would be of the greatest benefit to science, and probably set at rest many disputed points both of treatment and disease. The legislature, we think, would not refuse the governing bodies of the profession the necessary authority for carrying these objects into effect, provided they were applied to from the proper quarters, and an efficient plan proposed.

One of the most remarkable effects, arising out of the increased duration of human life, is the encrease of the population. At the commencement of the 17th century, the population of England and Wales amounted to 5,134,516: in 1831,\* it rose to 14,174,204, or nearly treble; and it is observable that the successive increments, by which this was effected,\* did not occur in an arithmetical ratio, but in proportion as the causes, arising out of increased wealth and civilization, came into operation. Thus the increment for the first half of the last century was 905,368, or  $17\frac{2}{3}$  per cent; but for the second half, it amounted to 3,147,492, or upwards of 52 per cent. Political economists, at one time, endeavoured to resolve this into the increased number of births and marriages, which took place under such circumstances, or to the increased fecundity of marriage, although nothing can be more opposed to the fact: for in the early part of the last century, the number of marriages for England and Wales was 1 in 115; but, in 1821, it had diminished to 1 in 131; and in the same manner, the proportion of births, which in 1801, was 1 in 34.8 of the whole population, had diminished to 1 in 38.58 in 1821. Nothing, indeed, is now better established, than that the number of births, relatively to the whole population, diminishes as civilization advances, not because an increasing prudence on the part of the people operates as a "preventive check," deterring people from entering into the bonds of matrimony, but because there is in the world a larger proportionate number of persons to whom the engagements of matrimony have ceased to offer any charms. It is probable that, if the estimate were made in reference to that part of the population only, which is still in the vigour of life, the number of marriages would not be found to have diminished; and this is rendered still more probable from the state of the burials: for from 1751 to 1761 the total number of burials within the bills of mortality, was 205,279; of which, 106,264, or  $51\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, were of persons under 20 years of age; but from 1831 to 1834, the number of burials was 80,524, of which 34,109, or only  $42\frac{1}{2}$  were of persons under 20 years of age. It appears, therefore, beyond doubt, that the extension of human life is one of the chief causes of the encrease of population.

Before we conclude, we have only to offer our best thanks to Mr. Porter, for the interesting work whose title we have set at the head of this article; and which assuredly abounds with valuable facts, clearly arranged and accurately deduced from the most authentic public documents. As a statist, Mr. Porter is already favourably known to the public. He possesses the prime qualifications of accuracy, diligence, and perspicuity, united to soundness

of judgment, purity of style, and a gentlemanly tone of feeling. We do not, therefore, hesitate to recommend his work to our readers, or to predict that it will (when completed) become a standard authority, on all subjects of national statistics. We should suppose that it will extend to three or four more volumes: one only has yet appeared.

---

- ART. V.—1. *The Book of Beauty*. Edited by the Countess of Blessington. 8vo. London. 1836.  
 2. *The Keepsake*. Edited by the Lady Emmeline Stuart Wortley. 8vo. London. 1836.  
 3. *The Confessions of an Elderly Gentleman*. By the Countess of Blessington. 8vo. London. 1836.  
 4. *Adventures of Bilberry Thurland*. 3 vols. 8vo. London. 1836.  
 5. *The Life and Works of Cowper*. By Robert Southey, Esq. LL.D. Poet Laureat. Vols. 1-8. 8vo. London. 1836. •

THE extension of the field of literature, and the new channels into which knowledge has been made to run, in the present age, will form a very interesting subject of observation to those who come after us. It cannot be denied, that the various departments of art, science, and general literature, have been prosecuted with great avidity, and by a much larger number of persons, than at any former period. There never was a time, in which so large a proportion of THE PEOPLE entered into such enquiries. The vast intercourse of the great commercial nations of Europe, especially of England, with all parts of the globe, has greatly extended our geographical and statistical knowledge. Abundance of travellers, naval, military, scientific, and literary, have run to and fro upon the earth, and knowledge of the different nations, of their morals, manners, and modes of belief, no less than of their various natural and artificial productions, has been wonderfully encreased. From the same causes, natural history has received a new impulse, and an immense accession of facts. Some branches of it may almost date their origin from the present day; such as ichthyology, conchology, and entomology. Natural philosophy, too, has made a rapid progress; and chemistry, through the wonderful agency of electricity, under its different forms, has opened an unexpected acquaintance with the laws of matter, and thus at once improved the arts of social life, and given us new views of the power and wisdom of the Creator.

The first effect of this sudden and surprising growth of know-



ledge was the formation of literary and scientific associations; the second, was the equally sudden, and not less surprising extension of the periodical press. What a host of journals, reviews and magazines, has sprung up! We are no longer doomed, like our fathers, to behold Sylvanus Urban, and the Monthly Review, sailing in solitary glory, along the wide ocean of literature, the old gentleman bowing most politely to his throng of contributors,—lovers, poets, antiquaries, country clergymen, and retired officers; and the Monthly Review telling Samuel Rogers, in the commencement of his career, that he wrote very pretty prose, but that he must be advised, and attempt no more poetry! That day is gone by, and, if a wiser age has not arisen, a more knowing one has. We have journals without end. Every class of people has its periodical organ of enquiry and intelligence. The great political parties have, besides the daily and weekly newspaper-press, their Quarterly Reviews, and their Monthly Magazines, their Blackwoods, their Frazers, and their Tait's, from which they batter the outworks of their opponents, and proclaim the views and prospects of their leaders. Just so the religious world is provided with its journals of advocacy and defence. We have Catholic Magazines, Church Magazines, and Dissenting Magazines. Every sect has its organ, through which it conveys, at once, to its adherents, intelligence of the movements of the body, and a certain portion of general literary news. The Army, the Navy, the Law, and Medicine, every class of philosophic and scientific men, have their magazines too. We have Colonial Magazines, Magazines of Agriculture, Horticulture, Botany, Entomology, Chemical Philosophy, Mechanics, Music—every man, be he who or what he may, has his journal, wherein he finds every new fact and improvement, connected with his peculiar pursuit, carefully recorded. This must necessarily produce an amazing effect on the propulsion of enlightened enquiry, and the diffusion of knowledge, and is, at once, the work of the present age, and the indication of its altered character, and onward course. There may, indeed, be some departments of science or learning, which are not so exclusively pursued as heretofore; it may be true that classical and mathematical studies have lost much of their ancient attraction, and that neither are cultivated with the ardour or the seriousness which once distinguished the addresses of their votaries:—but, without pausing to debate this point, it may be safely asserted, that if, in any department, the present age is not so profound as former ones, on a thousand subjects of important knowledge its spirit of enquiry is more active; that its range is infinitely more extended; and that the consequences are already beginning to manifest themselves in the general advancement of social comfort, and the moral elevation of the race.

But, besides the journals to which we have here alluded, those of General Literature have multiplied in the same, if not in greater, proportion. They appear on all hands, and, increasing with every successive month, testify to the extraordinary growth of reading, and of literary habits among the people. These publications—and some, already mentioned, belong to the same class,—combine story and song with subjects of general criticism; and thus form a sort of common ground, where the lover of philosophy or science may find a refreshing relaxation, and the enquirer after general knowledge may continue to increase his stores. It is to this class that the *Annals*, the *Penny Sheets*, and the reprints of standard works, in monthly volumes, may be properly said to belong.

The *Annals*, much as they have been ridiculed, have produced various and decided effects on the public taste. To say nothing of the splendid style of external embellishment, which they have introduced, they have widely diffused the love of the fine arts; they have circulated highly finished engravings of beautiful and interesting subjects; and they have thus taught the people to admire what, otherwise, they would never have beheld. It is true, indeed, that, as regards the literary department, there was something in the original plan of these periodicals too monotonous to maintain its hold on the public fancy. A regular alternation of a short prose story, and a shorter poem—prose and verse—prose and verse—and this throughout a dozen volumes, issuing from the press at the same moment,—it required more than mortal ingenuity to give force and variety to such matter. Many of them, moreover, were loaded with the contributions of friends and amateur authors, which, however their cheapness might recommend them to the editors, had nothing to recommend them to the public. Yet in these very volumes lies a mass, and that no trivial one, of some of the most ingenious and exquisite prose stories, no less than of some of the most original among the smaller poems, of which the modern language of England can boast.

But the original race of *Annals* is nearly extinct; another has risen in its place, which, with fresh objects, and under new forms, has answered to the cry for novelty that is abroad. We have now a variety of these publications, adapted to the wants and wishes of each variety of readers. One is the *Annual of the Religious World*, filled with missionary narratives, religious biographies, and grave papers on subjects of piety and philanthropy. Another, that of Mr. Watts, is the *Cabinet of Modern Art*, devoting its pages to the interest and the love of the fine arts, and abounding with notices of the most distinguished professors; and is, as it always has been, the first of the whole class for felicitous selec-

tion, and the high finish of its engravings. A third is of a different order: it is devoted to the tastes of the aristocracy, and is placed under the editorship, the guidance, and the patronage of titled ladies! To this belongs "*The Book of Beauty*," edited by the Countess of Blessington, and "*The Keepsake*," edited by the Lady Emmeline Stuart Wortley. They may be classed with another demi-variety of large dimensions, and most gaudy attire, — "*Drawing-Room Scrap-Books—Flowers of Loveliness—Gems of Flowers, &c. &c.*" books of ample drawings, and ampler margins, on which every possible device of external embellishment, and internal nothingness, has been lavished.

But to these latter flaunting productions we have given merely a glance; into the purely aristocratic publications we have looked with a good deal of curiosity, because they indicate another of the remarkable fashions in modern literature—that descent of the angelic hosts into the plains of the poor shepherds of the pen; or in plainer language, of the legion of the titled into the vocation of those who have no titles, except such as rest upon their books, and such as their industry and intellect can acquire.

We do not deny that, in these publications, there is much educated and polished cleverness; much good-sense, tarnished, it is true, with no little coxcombry; and much travelled knowledge, for which we are thankful enough: but there is far more of weary common-place, and hacknied love-story, of fashionable and unnatural sentiment. There is a total want of the newness and freshness of feeling, the bold design, and daring departure from the beaten track, which mark the original and independent mind. In "*The Keepsake*," there are some good things, by persons already well known to the public. Lady Dacre has a very clever and spirited dramatic sketch, called "*The Old Bachelor's House*," and Lord Nugent is the author of a tale, with the fantastic title, "*The Sea! The Sea!*" in which there is some very vigorous writing, and some very beautiful and healthy sentiment, not unworthy of his established reputation and liberal spirit. But, after all, the preserving salt, both of this volume and of "*The Book of Beauty*," will be found under such names as Barry Cornwall, Mrs. Shelley, Mrs. S. C. Hall, Alfred Tennyson, Mr. H. F. Chorley, Walter Savage Landor, Sir William Gell, &c. &c. Take, for example, the following grandiloquent lines, from a poem written by the Lady Emmeline Stuart Wortley, on visiting the mother of Napoleon Buonaparte:—

" My thought was of all mysteries of our fate,  
 All miseries man doth for himself create;  
 All terrors, and all triumphs, and all woes,  
 All harsh oppressions, which this doomed earth knows:

Of desperate feuds, and blood-stained anarchie  
*And ground-born tempests thundering up the skies ;*  
 Of fortune's varying course, and freaks of change ;  
 Of dread catastrophes austere and strange ;  
 Of wondrous retributions, dooms of fear,  
 And dark ordeals, and expiations drear ;  
 Of judgments stern, and visitations sore,  
 And wild vicissitudes unknown before ;  
 Of earth's proud sovereignties imperial, made  
 The spoils and appanage of one arrayed  
 In gory stole of victory's stern success,  
 A dreaded name, but an adored no less,  
 By those oft marshalled to red conquest's field,  
 —The veteran heroes long untaught to yield—  
 By him, the suzerain of the sceptered ! him,  
 Before whose star all others there waxed dim !  
 My thought was of bowed thrones and shattered shrines,  
 Of marvels, and of mysteries, and designs  
 Vasty and strange—of venturous enterprise,  
 And royal, proud, stupendous pageantries,  
 Out-going all of pomp that yet had been,  
 Yet vanishing like vapours from the scene !  
*Of desperate tribulations shuddering round—*  
 Convulsions fierce, calamities profound—  
 Of all things startling, and of all things strange,  
 Beyond imagination's wildest range !"      **KEEPSAKE**, p. 82-3.

And all this, and a great deal more, (for there are nine pages of it) while mounting a pair of stairs ! Now, contrast with this the following piece of deep and simple feeling, from Barry Cornwall.

THE LADY TO HER LOVER'S PICTURE.

" O DARK, deep, pictured eyes !  
 Once more I seek your meaning, as the skies  
 Were sought by wizards once from eastern towers,  
 When signs of fate dawned through the night's bright hours.  
 O master of my soul, to whom belong  
 These starry lights of love ! thou dost me wrong—  
 Thy heart doth wrong me, if it hath not told  
 That she who loved of old  
 So deeply, still awaits thee—loving yet :  
 She loves, she watches,—why dost *thou* forget ?

Upon what pleasant shore, or summer waters  
 Dost thou repose ? Hath time,  
 Or the dark witchery of the Indian daughters,—  
 Or some luxurious clime,—  
 The natural love of change,—or graver thought,—  
 Or new ambition,—all my misery wrought ?

- " *Why art thou absent? Is not all thy toil  
Done, on that burning soil?  
Are thy dreams unaccomplished? Let them go!  
She, who stood by thee once, in want and woe,  
And would have dared all dangers, hand in hand,  
Hath risen! A maiden peeress of the land,  
She woos thee to behold and share her state,  
And be by fortune, as by nature, great.*
- " *Still am I young! but wrinkled age will steal  
Upon me unawares, shouldst thou delay;  
And time will kiss these auburn locks to grey;  
And grief will quench mine eyes: and I shall feel  
That thou canst love me not (all beauty flown),  
And so I shall depart,—and die alone.*
- " *And then,—thou'lt hear no more of one, whose course  
Hath been so dark, until too-late remorse,  
Half wakening love, shall lead thee, some chance day,  
To where the marble hides my mouldering clay,  
And there thou'lt read—not haply without pain—  
The story of her who loved, and lived in vain."*

BOOK OF BEAUTY, pp. 136-7.

That raises our spirits! That is the true vintage of Parnassus!  
That is the clear expression of the pure, deep, generous feeling  
of a true and untainted nature!

The mention of this poem leads us to point out the "Imaginary Conversation" of Savage Landor. It is a dialogue held by Colonel Walker, who put an end to female infanticide in Guzerat, with a father and his two daughters. "Walker," says Landor, "abolished infanticide, yet we hear of no equestrian statue, no monument of any kind, erected to him in England, or India." The article is full of those noble sentiments which live in a noble heart. It brings before the public a man and a deed which deserve our highest honour; and we particularly recommend it, therefore, to the notice of our titled amateur writers. If they will write to good purpose, if they really wish to fix themselves in the heart of the public, they must take such productions as this for their models, not in manner, but in spirit. They must employ themselves on subjects which interest our humanity, and tend to raise, to correct, and to console it. We want no *fade* details of a meretricious life, already sufficiently known, and more than sufficiently sickening. We want no lessons in intrigue, no sighings of adulterous inamoratas; but we ask for sound and serious thought, for that in which the heart of man will find the food of emulation, and the life of hope. This paper, and another in the "Book of Beauty," by Sir William Gell,

"On the Romantic History of the Arabs in Spain," are worthy of a better volume.

But we must take a passing glance at "The Confessions of an Elderly Gentleman," for here we find the annual moulding itself into a new variety; a variety, which we do not hesitate to pronounce the most odious and pernicious. For what in fact is it? A sort of hybrid production, a something between the fashionable novel, and the most tawdry species of the annual. We have had what are called fashionable novels poured upon us by thousands. We have been deluged with disgusting descriptions of a life devoted to heartless splendour, and heartless rivalry; to dissipation that leaves no domestic enjoyment; to expenditure that consigns thousands of unfortunate and imploring tradesmen to ruin; to the most unhallowed and filthy intrigues which ever disgraced human nature. And what have we in the story before us? Not certainly the fashionable novel, for it is not in three volumes: not the annual, for it may reappear at any day or any hour: but we have the morality of the one compressed into the dimensions of the other: we have the same profligacy of heart, the same recklessness of character and conduct, which have distinguished the worst of its predecessors. An aged seducer describes the prowess of his early wickedness. He leads us from scene to scene, from "adventure" to "adventure." He hints at intrigues, and feigns an anxiety to conceal them. He sneers at the most sacred ties of social and moral life, libels the character of our females, and concludes a vapid history of disgusting crime, by showing only that he has been the silly dupe of his own vanity and heartlessness. Now we mean not to charge the writer of this, and other similar volumes, with any deliberate intention to corrupt the morals of the rising generation. It may be, nay, we doubt not that it is, designed to act as a warning against the corruption of the age; but we maintain, that to make scenes of vice familiar to the youthful mind is not the wisest way to preserve its innocence; and we put it, therefore, to Lady Blessington herself, no less than to the public, who are to patronize her, whether such works, or, at least, such subjects, ought not at once to be put down.

Before we proceed to notice the only remaining literary fashions of the time, we must introduce to our readers a book of a description widely different from those which we have just been describing. We have been speaking of the novel of what is called *HIGH LIFE*; we have here the novel of what is denominated *LOW LIFE*. The book accidentally attracted our attention, by the humour of some extracts which we saw, and, having read it, we do not hesitate to say, that it contains more original talent than a whole host of fashionable novels. Not, indeed, that we consider

it the best specimen of the class to which it belongs. With some strength, it certainly contains more of weak and wearying detail than is often met with in the same space. There is a want of keeping, too, in the principal character, and an absence of interest in the story, which must necessarily detract from any other merits it may possess.\* Still, it affords a striking contrast to the publications of which we have been speaking; and, on this ground alone, we feel ourselves justified in alluding to it. If it contains so many imperfections, what must be those productions which it so far excels?

The hero of the story is Bilberry Thurland, a person, who, without much knowledge of the circumstances in which he came into the world, finds himself, during his early years, under the practical tuition of his only recognised parent—his mother. The latter is a licensed hawker, who, to the profession of the pedlar, unites the arts of the trumper; and duly instructs her son in the various mysteries of the two pursuits. At length, however, they are separated. The mother is imprisoned, and Bilberry, thrown for the first time on his own resources, passes through the different employments,—first, of a farming servant, then of an itinerant vender of sand, afterwards of a servant to a private gentleman, and, finally, of a strolling player. Here his good fortune begins to develop itself. He marries a young woman, the natural daughter of his late master, who had left her a legacy of £3000, and, having purchased a small homestead in the village where he had first lived, became, as usual, the progenitor of a numerous race, and was at length “peacefully gathered to the dust.” We subjoin an extract or two, as affording the most favourable specimen of the author’s manner.

The following is a striking and vivid picture of the workings of conscience on the mind of a murderer. The culprit has been condemned to death, and, the night before his execution, he confesses the details of the murder, which had been accomplished by the drowning of the victim. The revelation seems to have relieved his feelings; and he, not unnaturally, looks back to the mental suffering through which he has passed.

“‘I have had no peace nor rest these two years; ever since that night, I have been a miserable fellow as ever lived,’ said he; ‘that Wilson has appeared before my eyes many times.’ The Parson told him that was his evil conscience; but Bobb told him again, he did not know what he was talking about, because he had not seen it. Says Lowe, ‘If you had seen it, as I have, as plain as I see you at this blessed moment, you would not say it was my conscience, any more than you yourself are my conscience.’

“‘On dark rainy nights particularly,’ said he, ‘it used to come up when I was watching the kiln, (he was a brickmaker) and stand before

me as if it was alive; and if I had not known it was Wilson, I should have thought it was somebody belonging to the place. It used to come and look at me a little time, and then seem as if it wanted to warm its hands by the fire, and dry itself. But it never could; for it staid all night before the kiln, and seemed to be always dropping wet, like as if it had been just got out of the Trent. Sometimes I thought it *moaned*, and said the same as Wilson said about Liza Hammond when we flung him over; and that hurt me more and more: so that I used to shut my eyes, and put my fingers in my ears, and get somebody to sit down close to me in the blaze of the kiln, to see if we could not frighten it away. But what use was that? It was under my eyelids directly; and I did not know whether they were shut or open, till I felt of them with my fingers. And then it seemed to come closer and closer, and I could see water run out of its eyes, and it would say, 'Why hadn't you some pity?' And sometimes, when the wind blew hard, and drifted round the kiln in a stream, it was blown all about like smoke; but it came back again, and settled over against me, and shivered, and wrung the wet off its hands, as if it were starved to death.

"At last," said he, "I got tired of seeing it, and I felt as if it would crumble my heart to dust. I took no pleasure in drinking ale, as I used to do; and I said to Jack Swanwick, one time when we had been talking about it together, said I, 'Jack, I am sick of my life, such as it is,—will you throw me over?' For, do you know, I must not do it myself; because, when I thought of such a thing sometimes,—as I did often stand on the kiln wall, and think I would throw myself into the fire, because I was only fit for hell,—it would come up directly, as bright as silver, and cry like a child before me.

"So I put my hands before my face, and went down to the clay-pools to wash my forehead cold. I never could think of killing myself, but there it was, as if it wanted me to live till God should call me. So I turned to my work like a man, and took to going to church of a Sunday, as I never had done in my life before. But I used to see it for all that, till I asked Jack Swanwick to fling me over the wall, in the same place as we had flung Wilson. \* \* \* It was in the autumn time that was; and when we were getting towards the brig-foot, says I, 'Jack, will you do for me now?'—'I'll fling you over as soon as look at you, if you like,' says he, and he laid hold of my arm. But when we were getting against the same place, he stopped all at once, and says he, 'Bob, what is that on the wall?' Good God! I knew what it was in a moment, and I turned like ice when he said he saw it as well as me. 'It's that d—d Esau,' said he in his drunken courage, 'and I'll go and knock him off.' I caught hold of his arm, and held him fast, but I could not speak. Jack was resolute, and pulled hard to go; but when he saw he could not get away, he doubled his fist, and held it up towards where the thing was, and says he, 'You devil you, what have you come out of the Trent for?' And then he made a sudden start to get at it; but something came across his mind at that moment, and he fell down on his knees, and prayed to the Lord like a preacher.

"When he got up again, his face dropped sweat; and, says he,



‘Bob, let us go away from here, for there is a dead man about, come out of his dust again. He licked my eyes with a tongue like iron, and I can see the stones of that wall, and Wilson’s blood on them, as plain as sunshine, and yet it is as dark as pitch.’

“‘So we tried to cross the brig, but it came again, and set a row of fire across from one wall to the other, and stood in the middle itself, with its arms and head hanging down, as if it were dead. We turned back and got into the Horse-shoes again, (the public-house, which they had just left), and there we stopped till they turned us out at twelve. But we durst not go over the brig again; so we went and staid under a hedge all that cold night, but we never shut our eyes.’”

There is a beautiful little episode of an Italian boy, with whom Bilberry accidentally fell in. It was at the moment when Bilberry was first separated from his mother. The boy had had his hurdy-gurdy smashed, and the leg of his monkey broken. The monkey died, and Bilberry and his new friend having buried it, set off to seek their fortunes.

“The evening proved extremely warm;....a narrow river, that flowed through the fields, grassed down to the very edge, tempted them at first sight to strip off their clothes; and, as these were neither abundant nor very closely hung on, by the next minute they were in the stream. The young Italian, who boasted he could swim, dashed, at once, into the sullen blackness of the farther side, and, in a moment, was gone. The undermined bank, and the tangled roots laid bare, seemed to tell of a deep bed and a treacherous current. Bilberry instinctively got back on to the grass, and, helpless himself, shouted in vain for help. The grazing cattle held up their heads a moment at the noise; but neither man nor dwelling could be seen across the silent meadows. He turned again to the stream; there was no cry—no bubbling in the water—no struggling against death. Only once, at a long distance down the river, did he see the wavy black hair of the boy come up above the surface a moment, as the body apparently was interrupted in its course by the boughs of a fallen tree.

“Yet Bilberry stood a long time watching in miserable hope. He could scarcely believe what during the last few minutes had passed before his eyes; and, once or twice, he involuntarily called to his companion by name. But he had heard the call of a GREATER VOICE, bidding him come away for ever from a world too unkind. Those who had broken his music, and beaten him, the other night, had done him but little harm. He had no more need of begging; for he had gone to where, for such as him, mercy unasked bestows abundantly.”

One extract more:—it describes the last days of William Spowage, one of Bilberry’s early companions. He was grown old; and the author proceeds:—

“That spirit, which, before Justice Barton, had boasted of never having received sixpence from any parish in England, was all gone, broken down, quite forgotten, under the infirmities and oppression of years; and a crust or a farthing, was a gift received with many thanks.

" Friends, be not hard-hearted. Man may be a hypocrite, a villain, a fool,—we ourselves may be one or the other of these before we die;—who knows what he shall yet come to? Man may be old and poor, with all his hypocrisy and folly; 'but man is man for all that'; and, as such, while life is in him, nature loudly declares to us, that between his kind and him, the cord of sympathy shall not be broken. In the contemplation of the present, the past, if not totally forgotten, is, and ought to be, obscured by the veil of human charity.

" For me, I cannot look on an old man, whatever he may have been, without tenderness, and pity, and veneration, at once rising up and demanding their places in my bosom. If he be poor and helpless, charity also asks to be admitted, and to intercede for him.

" Creation hath ten thousand things that demand our veneration,—the bare and hoary mountain, the ever-enduring sea, the unchangeable heavens over our heads, even the fading yet majestic old oak of the moor: but of all things beneath the sun, MAN, in his decline, is infinitely the most venerable. To think how the mind has been broken, the heart has been subdued! How the delights of childhood and youth have passed! How the world, in which *we* rejoice, has become a blank to him! To think of all the joys that are passed—of all the misery that is now!

" Nature gives us all good hearts at our birth: but the world meddles therewith, and sends them back to the grave ruined.

" 'William Spowage, I give thee my last groat!'

" As I said this, I passed the old man by a thorn hedge-side, as he was hobbling along through one of the most rural and beautiful parts of England. It was south of the Trent, not more than five miles from the old town of Nottingham. Little did it enter my mind, at that moment, that I should never see him again; that he would never reach his destination that night. But so it was.

" This was about sunset. I had been enjoying a country ramble since shortly after daybreak the same morning. I had passed through many villages, through many pastoral districts, through valley, field, and over mountain; but amongst them all did I find nothing to be compared for beauty of situation and variety of scenery, to this delightful village of Clifton, which was destined to be the last reposing place of the bones of William Spowage.

\* \* \* \* \*

" A beautiful evening it was; and one which the events of the night that followed served to impress more fully on my memory.

" I sate on an old bench at the door (of the village alehouse), the church on one hand, a wide grove of mast-like trees on the other, from the depths of which the melancholy wood-pigeon cooed hollowly and mournfully, while the blackbird and linnet, from some far low hedge-top, sent their evening songs along the uplands, like the voice of Nature herself, bidding the soul of the dwellers there be at rest and peace. Before me, and far below, at the foot of the high precipitous hill on which the grove is situated, swept the broad waters of the river Trent, while over its quiet surface flew a thousand swallows and sand martins,

which annually make their homes in the high bare precipice which terminates the western end of the grove. Overhead, between the parted branches, the eye caught a few glimpses of the warm and bright blue zenith; while below, level with the sight, the extremity of the western sky shone between a hundred slender stems, like a chequered work of jet and gold. Everything amid this scene was perfectly still; even the gentle wind, which, while the sun was up, had tempered the heat of the day, had now died all away, and left the leaves, drooping from the beech and sycamore, unstirred, and the tall seed stems of the rank grass beneath, as quiet and untrembling as though they were carved in alabaster.

"An eternal sabbath seemed to reign there, but for the ploughman or the sower seen on the surrounding hill-sides, or the resounding of the woodman's axe being heard now and then from the depths of some far-off plantation.

"It was an hour for reflection; and, influenced in the train of my thoughts by the unhappy object I had shortly before passed on the hedge-row side, I considered pensively on the life of man, the fate to which he is born, the end and purpose of his whole existence.

\* \* \* "As my thoughts ran thus, the object who had excited them came along the village, cottage after cottage, begging his bread.

"Still, I felt the weight of sorrowful thoughts. They of whom he begged were little better than he. It is hard to beg; it is harder to turn away the beggar. The heart can more easily be subdued to humility, than hardened to unkindness. A beautiful truth, this, in the page of natural humanity. May it ever be so!

"I watched him so long as the disposition of the cottages and the direction of the road allowed him to remain in sight; sat musing another hour in the gathering gloom, while the bat flitted awkwardly along the air, and the owlet screamed from the steeples of the grove; and then retired for the night to an humble pallet prepared for me beneath the roof of that rustic inn.

"On arising early next morning, the first intelligence I received was, that one of the villagers, having gone down to the Trent at daybreak to water his horses, had discovered the body of the old beggar, who was asking charity in the village the preceding day, lying in very shallow water, quite dead. Such then, was the end of William Spowage."

Having thus gone over and placed in strong contrast the bulk of the literary changes of the present day, their spirit and their probable results, we proceed to the remaining portion of our task,—the cheap sheets, and the reprints of standard works of literature. In these we have the most unqualified satisfaction. If we were to draw our opinion of the morals, no less than of the literary taste of the time, from the trumpery and tinsel character of the publications, which we have here found it necessary to condemn, we should necessarily pronounce the age to be both frivolous and corrupt. We should regard it as devoted to mere dissipation and heartless folly: we should suppose that every thing

like the plain old English character was gone; that we were arrived at that stage of national luxury, that corruption of morals and of taste, which all history has shown to precede a national decline. This, however, would be unjust. That a corruption of taste and manners, of morals, and modes of thinking, does exist in this country, as it must among all wealthy nations, is too true: but we have only to turn to the publications which circulate amongst the middle classes, amongst the vast mass of those who may be said to afford a true sample of the majority—and we shall be at once convinced that this corruption is comparatively partial. We shall see that the frivolous and heartless productions, so much puffed and paraded, by reviewers and publishers, are merely addressed to the frivolous and the heartless; and that there is an ample demand, from the thinking, the inquiring, the sober and the religious public, for works of a higher and a better class. There never was a time, when a greater number of excellent volumes was diffused through the families of the middle classes in this country, and, as we have already said, when the influence of sound reading and enquiry extended itself so far down into the very cottages and dwellings of the poor. Literature has been made as cheap and accessible as it was possible for an extensive demand, stereotyping, and steam-presses to make it. A multitude of sheets, containing a mass of the most valuable information, and distinguished by a high moral tone, have been circulated at the price of one penny, or three halfpence, each, and have thus been enabled to make their way, for the first time, through the lowest alleys of crowded cities, through field and forest, and over moor and mountain, to the huts of the labourer, the miner, the shepherd, and the fisherman. Nor has the information, conveyed in such publications as the Penny Magazine,\* and Chambers' Edinburgh Journal, been confined solely to the poor. These works have been *emphatically gleaners*,—gleaners from all books of art, science, philosophy, and general literature: they have collected facts, that lay wide asunder, and beyond the reach of thousands; and they have, by this means, recommended themselves to the attention of persons in every rank of society. In fact, they have attempted, and we think, successfully, to awaken a spirit of enquiry, and a more intellectual tone of feeling, in society. Chambers' Edinburgh Journal, in particular, contains articles on morals, social manners, historical, and even antiquarian, subjects, of the most interesting description; and, as a

---

\* We are glad of this opportunity to correct an unintentional error in the first number of this Review. The remarks, made at page 173, in disparagement of the Penny Magazine, were intended for another publication. They certainly do not apply to the "Penny Magazine."

proof of its popularity, can already boast, that it circulates the enormous number of upwards of seventy thousand copies per week.

This, then, is a literary fashion evidently pregnant with the most important consequences to the community: the other, and the last which we have to notice,—the reprints of standard works in monthly volumes, is not less remarkable, either as an indication of popular taste, or as tending still farther to regulate and improve it. This mode of publication was first attempted in the small Cyclopædias, or Libraries. There was the ‘Family,’ the ‘Classical,’ the ‘Sunday,’ and the ‘Novellist’s Libraries; the ‘Library of Romance,’ of ‘Entertaining Knowledge,’ of ‘Useful Knowledge,’ of ‘Natural History;’ ‘Constable’s Miscellany,’ ‘Lardner’s Cabinet Library,’ and ‘Cabinet Cyclopædia,’ &c. &c.: and these, by a very natural transition, led to the adoption of that plan, which is likely to lay a more lasting and beneficial hold on the public mind,—the reprints of some of the best works of our standard English writers. This important change commenced with the *Waverley Novels*, and has been pursued through all the works of Sir Walter Scott. We have already had, under this system, handsome editions of the works of Byron, Crabbe, Shakspeare, Milton, and Coleridge: we have in progress, those of Cowper, Wordsworth, Pope, Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham, and others; and we are already informed, that these are to be followed by a series of what the publisher calls our ‘Imperial Classics,’ to commence with Burnet’s ‘*History of His Own Times*.’ It is evident that a more general acquaintance with the works of our best writers, will be the necessary consequence of this fortunate innovation.

As we have mentioned the reprints of our standard writers, we cannot part from the subject, without noticing, among those which have already appeared, ‘*The Life, Letters, and Poetical Works of Cowper*.’ The subject, indeed, is one, to which, on a future occasion, we shall probably revert in a separate article. In the meantime, however, we cannot forbear adverting to it in a few concluding remarks; for it is too closely connected with our present topic, to be entirely passed over in silence. It is, in fact, by such publications as this, that we are enabled to vindicate the national taste and to prove, that, with all the meretricious frivolity of certain classes, England is still sound at heart, still full of happy and intelligent families, where every thing that is simple, every thing that is pure, every thing that is characterized by sound sense, and sound morality, is yet valued and enjoyed.

What a striking contrast, indeed, does the spirit, and even the outward form, of these volumes present, to the spirit and fashion of the works, which we were lately noticing! There, all was *showy*

and unsubstantial. There wanted the heart and the soul of sound writing: the breathings of pure domestic affection, and the aspirings after the improvement of the race. We read for the most part without satisfaction, and often with disgust. But here, we find ourselves, at once, in the very sanctuary of domestic love, amongst spirits of intelligence, and beings of unvitiated tastes. We feel around us an atmosphere of true English worth. The personages recommended to our admiration are worthy of it: they are specimens of the true gentility of England; simple, yet elegant, living in the very heart of peace, in the beautiful retirements of our fair country, with books, and music, and hospitality, and refined enjoyments about them; while the chief character is ever employed on subjects calculated to crown him with a pure immortality, and become an everlasting legacy of high thoughts and ennobling feelings to future generations. What a contrast is here! And yet, it is in this very contrast that we discover the proudest vindication of the taste and character of the people. If there are some, who sigh over the tawdry and unmeaning trash, which we have had occasion to condemn, there are more who feel their minds exalted, and their spirits raised, above "the earth that compasseth them," by the "sweet songs" of Cowper. With these, who are emphatically the *nation*, his name is as "a household word:" his song and his sufferings are entwined in their affections; and they hail the fortunate occasion, which is about to make his virtuous musings "familiar things" among their families.

We have no design to institute a comparison between the two editions of Cowper, simultaneously issuing from the press. Southey's is the one before us, and as we have not seen the other, it is the only one of which we can be expected to speak. On the editor's qualifications for his task, it would be superfluous to dwell. In a knowledge of English literature he is second to none; his industry is proverbial; and from his poetical and domestic tastes, he is the very man to comprehend, and do justice to, Cowper. Yet, we felt not the full extent of Southey's powers, of his indefatigable disposition, and, when uninfluenced by any immediate religious or political antipathy, of his candid and discriminating spirit, until we had risen from the perusal of these volumes. Besides the life of Cowper, we have biographical notices of each distinguished contemporary that came within its sphere, together with a mass of notes, which, in the depth of their research, and the interesting nature of their details, have been seldom surpassed. At every point, the writer has prepared us to take a just view of the position of the man, and of the labours of the poet. In the history of English poetry, suggested by the mention of

*The Task*, in the relation of the various incidents, and the introduction of the various characters, which occupy his attention, the same depth of judgment, the same extent and accuracy of information, and, above all, the same practical wisdom and kindness of feeling, are every where discernible. Thus, without attempting to magnify the talents, or conceal the foibles of Hayley, he contrives to interest us in that writer's character, and to place him in that beautiful situation, where, from the very absence of all literary jealousy, he at once makes his way to our affections. The scene is at Eartham, the beautiful residence of Hayley, in the neighbourhood of the southern coast.\* It is in the day of Cowper's literary supremacy; yet he and his Mary are received and entertained there, with a cordiality, and a rejoicing sympathy, unexampled in the history of letters,—and this, by the very man, who feels that his own reputation is, at the same moment, waning before the brightness that encompasseth his guest! In the life of Cowper, few things have struck us so forcibly, as the many delightful friendships, with which Providence, as if to counterbalance the melancholy influence of his mental malady, continued to surround him. As one consoler of his dreary hours died, another invariably sprung up: and it would, perhaps, be difficult to find a piece of biography which brings before us such an assemblage of charming characters as we here meet with. There are Mary Unwin, her son, the Throckmortons, Lady Austin, Lady Hesketh, Johnny of Norfolk, Hill, Rose, Bull, Hayley and his son, Walter Bagot, and the rest. And where, indeed, is the novel, which contains such deeply interesting matter? The young bright life of the youthful poet in London, with his Temple associates, Thurlow, Hill, and others; his literary associates, Colman, Lloyd, Thornton, and Churchill; those two fair and sunny creatures, his cousins, Harriet and Theodora Cowper; and the attachment between Theodora and himself, which though prevented, by wise parental authority, from proceeding to marriage, produced an indelible impression on the mind of the poet, and, in the lady, one of the most beautiful and inextinguishable instances of devotion united with prudence, upon record. Then the dark chapter of his agony about the office in the House of Lords, and the mental aberration consequent upon it: the attempt at suicide, and the life-long despondency. We know of nothing more romantic, more absorbing, or more solemnly impressive. Again, how lovely are the characters that rise up to console and cheer this sensitive and intellectual being through the retired paths of life. Look at Lady Austin, and see, in her example,

what we often owe to woman in the privacy of the world. Without her we should have lost "The Task," "John Gilpin," and the "Translation of Homer;" and Cowper, with all the magnificent stores and feelings of his beauteous mind, would, probably, have passed away into oblivion. Without the unwearied care, and watchful devotion of Mary Unwin, and the open hand and heart of Lady Hesketh, the same result must have followed. These are the women whose names have a title to be recorded, whose portraits, speaking still of the virtues of the departed, deserve to be in the hands of the rising generation. The character of Lady Hesketh in particular, as every where presented in these volumes, full, as it is, of generosity and good-sense, strikes us as one of the most beautiful and finely balanced, which we recollect to have met with. And then, in addition to all this, we have the radiant spirit of Johnny of Norfolk at hand, ready to administer affectionately to all the wishes of his illustrious kinsman; Romney, the artist, and Hurdis, the poet, sharing their society; and Charlotte Smith writing her "Old Manor House" in the morning, and reading the composition of the day for their amusement in the evening.

But it is time to present our readers with an extract from this interesting work. The following is the substance of a letter to Mr. Southey, from a gentleman who withholds his name for very satisfactory reasons. It is new matter, and of a kind which will show what materials of romance may be found among the incidents of real life.

"John Cowper, the brother of the poet, was, in his boyhood, the school-fellow and early companion of my own father, and continued to be his most intimate and valued friend, till his early career was terminated, by the death recorded in his brother's letters. My father had the strongest affection for John Cowper's memory, and seldom talked of him without such sorrow for his loss, as made him willing to avoid the subject; but I well remember that, when, at the age of fourteen or fifteen, I once was running with a shilling to the door to have my fortune told by some travelling gipsies, then begging at it, my father stopped me, and, with more seriousness than I expected, besought me to give him my solemn promise, that, as long as I lived, I would never indulge that idle curiosity. Of course I did so, and enquired the reason; as he might be sure I was not superstitious enough to believe, and must know it was, at most, but an idle and innocent piece of nonsense. He told me the reason was, the effect such predictions had in after-life, and in hours of weakness, after some casual circumstance, perhaps, had proved true. He then told me the following story of John Cowper, under circumstances which made such an impression on my mind, that I can trust my memory, spite of the intervening period of nearly fifty years; but, in truth, it has never been out of my thoughts.

"John Cowper and my father, were both, when children, at a prepara-



tory school, at Felstead, in (I think) Essex. They both together enquired their future fortunes, from a travelling gipsy tinker, who came to beg at the school, and in an old soldier's red coat. He was a man, and not an old woman, as it seems the poet Cowper had been told. My father said, that his own share of the prophecy was common-place nonsense, which he forgot; but that it was predicted to Cowper, that he would only remain a very short time at Felstead, and would, after leaving it, be sent to a *larger* school; that he would go to the University, and, before he left it, would form an attachment strong enough to give him much disappointment, as it would not be mutual; that he would not marry *before* he was thirty, but that, *after* that age, his fate became obscure, and the lines of his hand showed no more prognostics of futurity." It actually happened, from some family accident which I have forgot, but, I believe, the illness and death of a near relative, that John Cowper was summoned to go home, by a servant who came express. There was nothing very marvellous in this coincidence, even supposing it accidental, or in the itinerant prophet having heard of some such illness. Cowper, too, did not return to Felstead, but was sent, I think, to Eton. My father, who was not an Etonian, continued, I believe, to hear from him; but, at all events, they again met at the University, where their intimacy was not only renewed, but cemented by the most cordial friendship. It continued after my father left Cambridge, where, if I did not misunderstand him, Cowper continued, at least occasionally, to reside. They saw each other continually, corresponded with each other, and belonged to a set of young friends, who, after leaving college, met by agreement annually, for three weeks or a month, at Grantham; and some of them hunted. My father married in a few years, and John Cowper more than once accompanied him and my mother into —. In these visits, he contrived to accomplish another part of the prediction, by becoming much attached to a younger sister of my father's, who assuredly did not return his affection. All these coincidences made an impression on John Cowper's imagination, and he often reminded my father of their interview with the pedlar at Felstead. When Cowper approached the age of thirty, I think, or at least, that which the gipsy fixed as the term of his prediction, my father saw him again at Cambridge, I believe on his way to town. Cowper was walking with him in one of the college gardens, in one of the avenues where the gate was open in front of them, and suddenly interrupted the conversation by exclaiming, 'Did you see that man pass?' My father, who observed nothing, asked him what man he meant? John Cowper replied, 'The very man you and I met at Felstead, and in a soldier's jacket. I saw him pass the gate.' 'They both ran to it, but in the public road saw no such person. Cowper said, 'It is a warning—you know he could predict nothing of me after my thirtieth year.' He mentioned this more than once, while my father remained in Cambridge, though not apparently dejected, and, I believe, in tolerable health. The real circumstances thus detailed, were, probably, known only to themselves; and John Cowper does not seem to have made mention of them, except in such illusions as gave rise to the vague reports which his brother disbelieved. It was, however, the last time that my father saw his friend. He sickened, whether from the prediction, or from some natural cause; and, surrounded

by zealous religionists, eager for what is called a conversion, his old and tried friends were never apprised of his danger, or their letters replied to, till they were shocked by the news of his death."

But it is necessary to draw to a conclusion. If, in the early part of this paper, we beheld the literature of the day gradually sinking to repose on the tasteless and meretricious novel of high life,—in the latter portion, we have had the satisfaction to see it rising to vigorous and healthful exertion, and promising to confine the heartless details of still more heartless intrigues to the circles to which they appear to be addressed. As we have already said, we have no fear for the *nation*. Whatever may be the taste of the idle, the dissolute, and the voluptuous, that of the *community* is still sound; and, while such books as Southey's Cowper, and the other reprints which we have mentioned, can find a circulation, we have little need to be apprehensive for the literary character of the people.

ART. VI.—1. *The Case of Maynooth College considered, with a History of the first establishment of that Seminary; an Account of the System of Education pursued in it; and a Review of the effect it has had on the character of the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland.* Dublin. 1836.

2. *Maynooth in 1834.* By Eugene Francis O'Beirne, late Student at Maynooth College. New Edition. Dublin. 1835.

3. *Eighth Report on Education in Ireland, with the Appendix.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 19th June 1827.

IT is curious to observe the different tone and temper, in which, as two opposite forces combine to produce a diagonal motion, the writers of the two pamphlets before us struggle towards the same object, openly avowed in the one, and scarcely concealed in the other. The first is a well-made little book, swelled out, by means of large type and spacious margin, to ninety clear pages—*professing* to draw its information from the most authentic sources, and affecting the utmost moderation in its statements; although, with a due disregard for the ordinary rules of logical deduction, its conclusions are bigoted and unfair in the last degree. The writer has not thought proper to give his name; and we have not heard anything, with regard to the authorship, sufficiently probable to warrant the trouble of a conjecture. The second is the very reverse, in almost every particular. With less of pretension in its exterior, it is all insolence, bluster, and abuse,

from the beginning to the end: the statements, almost without an exception, are groundless, or distorted; and a total disregard of truth is visible in every page. Yet, this insolent tirade is in fact a *corrected* edition, from which, "in deference to the punctilious judgment of the most influential Dublin publishers,"\* it was found necessary to exclude a great deal of disgusting ribaldry, which they were ashamed to give the public with the sanction of their names. In its present form, does it not speak volumes for the punctilious judgment of the "influential Dublin publishers?"

The pamphlet bears on its title-page the name of Eugene Francis O'Beirne, late student at Maynooth College: but it is commonly believed not to have been written by him, and the report of his own friends pronounces it "the ingenious device" of a gentleman, who has since given some of his own productions to the public, under a much higher name than that of Eugene Francis O'Beirne. The intemperate scurrility, however, which is here put into the mouth of the alleged author, betrays too much knowledge of the rule, "*reddere personæ convenientia cuique*," to allow us to suppose, for a moment, that it can have been written by the avowed author of the clumsy "Encyclical Letter of Gregory the Sixteenth." How unnatural, how discredited the state of religious feeling in these countries, when a malignant hatred of the Catholic Religion is a sure passport to patronage and reward! No matter how worthless or insignificant the individual—a degraded priest, or an expelled student,—talent can be purchased—character and credit forgot or assumed—truth and virtue dispensed with altogether! Let him but go through the idle ceremony of turning his back on the Church which has already discarded him, and he becomes at once an instrument fitted for all the purposes of its enemies!

Before we proceed to examine the particular merits of the pamphlets before us, it may be as well to enquire, for a moment, into the decency of the attack which we are about to repel. Maynooth College is undoubtedly a public establishment, open to the inspection, and subject to the animadversions, of the public: but if it shall turn out, that the very support which it receives is scarcely better than an insult, that, where much is required, little only is granted, and that, while the religion of one-eighth of the Irish population revels in the luxury of state provision, that of the whole remaining portion is left in comparative wretchedness and destitution, the reader may, perhaps, be tempted to enquire whether the attacks, that have been levelled against this solitary Catholic establishment, come with a very good grace from the members of the favoured minority. The Catholics of

---

\* Preface, p. iv.

Ireland constitute seven-eighths of the entire population; and though their portion of the general burdens of the country is not in the exact ratio of their number, yet that number will enable us to form some idea of the amount of their contributions to the purposes of the state. Of course, they have a right to expect a proportionate share of advantages in return. But that share they do not receive: and it is past endurance, therefore, that the very persons who profit most largely by this injustice, should turn round upon their defrauded countrymen, and endeavour, by their calumnies, to deprive them even of the paltry pittance that is doled out to them. We subjoin a few items, which may startle the most hardened upholder of the present outrageously disproportioned application of Ecclesiastical Revenues, and other funds, appropriated to the support of Protestantism.

* Estimated amount of the Tithe Compositions of			
Ireland	-	-	£668,888 14 2
† Estimated Income of the Irish Ecclesiastical Commissioners	-	-	83,440 3 3
‡ Net Amount of Episcopal Revenue in Ireland, on an average of three years, ending Dec. 31st, 1831			128,808 8 3
Between 1802 and 1834, the following sums were expended:—§			
Protestant Charter-Schools	-	-	741,773 0 0*
Foundling Hospitals	-	-	899,295 0 0
Between 1802 and 1831:—			
Society for Discountenancing Vice	-		124,721 0 0
Between 1802 and 1824:—			
¶ Grants to the Board of First Fruits	-		595,382 0 0
** Royal Bounty	-	-	25,400 0 0

So far, the expenditure is purely Irish, and strictly Protestant.

Net Income of the Sinecure Rectories in England and		
Wales	-	£ 17,095
Ditto, of Archiepiscopal and Episcopal Sees	-	160,292
Ditto, of Cathedral and Collegiate Churches	-	208,289
Ditto, of Separate Revenue of Dignitaries	-	66,405
Ditto, of Benefices, with or without the cure of souls	-	3,055,451
* Total Revenue,	-	£3,507,532

\* Return ordered 16th April 1835.      † Ibid.

‡ Return ordered 28th August 1833.

§ Return ordered 18th April 1834.      || Ibid.      ¶ Ibid.

\*\* Miscellaneous Estimates, 1836.—The number of Dissenters is 494,572.—(Paper ordered 14th August 1834.) Thus, while the Protestant Dissenters in Ireland scarcely reach to one-fifteenth of the number of their Catholic fellow-countrymen, they receive annually three times the sum voted to the latter. This disproportion, however, is trifling compared with that noticed above.

\* Report of Commissioners of Ecclesiastical Revenues.

† Money expended in purchasing Lands and Glebes for the Poor Clergy in England, between 1800 and 1831			1,607,650
‡ Commissioners for Building Churches :—			
	1834	-	6,000
	1835	-	3,000
	1836	-	3,000
Ditto,—Scotland :—			
	1834	-	1,544
	1836	-	1,431
§ Additional Churches, (Great Britain) 1834	-	-	40,000
Additional Ecclesiastical Establishments in the W. Indies :—			
	1834	-	19,800
	1835	-	20,800
	1836	-	20,300
¶ Rebuilding Chapels in Jamaica, 1835	-	-	12,750

Opposite to this enormous array of Protestant expenditure, we find the single, solitary sum annually voted by Parliament—

Education of the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland, £8,928.

Here is a specimen of the equal rights enjoyed under the British Constitution !!

To obviate the possibility of cavil, we have abstained from noticing the revenues of Trinity College, Dublin; because Catholics are admitted to a small share of the advantages it affords; and, as the Maynooth Grant is exclusively for the Irish Catholic Clergy, in making the contrast, we shall omit altogether the items of expenditure which are not strictly Irish.

If we divide equally over the intermediate years the entire sums granted to Charter-schools, Foundling Hospitals, the Society for the Suppression of Vice, and the Board of First-Fruits, and take the sum of the separate items applied annually to the support of Protestantism in Ireland, we shall arrive at the astounding, and apparently incredible fact, that, under the free and equal laws of Britain, THE STATE APPROPRIATES, FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE RELIGION OF ONE-EIGHTH OF THE ENTIRE POPULATION, ABOVE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVEN TIMES THE SUM ANNUALLY VOTED TO THE REMAINING SEVEN-EIGHTHS. Or, confining ourselves to particular items of the same order, if, with the amount of public money granted to Maynooth College, from its foundation, in 1795, to the present year, we compare the grants made to the *Protestant Charter-schools alone*, we shall find that the sum voted, in a period of thirty-two years, for the maintenance of this bungling, ill-managed, and atrocious

† Return ordered 28th August 1833.

‡ Paper ordered to be printed, 18th July 1836.

§ Paper ordered to be printed 18th July, 1836.

|| Ibid.

¶ Ibid.

system, is not far from *three times the amount*, which, *up to the present time*, the British Parliament has dealt out by annual votes, for the support of this solitary Catholic Institution, amid the growling bigotry, or contemptuous indifference, of the inveterate enemies of Catholics.

And yet this grant, as the public knows, is neither permanent in its nature, nor uncontrolled in its application. It is held on the precarious tenure of an annual vote of the House of Commons; and is subject, not only to the management of Trustees and Visitors appointed by act of Parliament, but also to the rigorous scrutiny of the Board of Public Accounts. If this annual vote were a matter of mere routine, the system, though ungracious, might yet be tolerable. But it is the very reverse. More of insult and calumny, and misrepresentation, has been disgorged against the Catholic religion, in the stupid debates upon this paltry grant, than on any other subject that has been introduced to the notice of the House: and many a time, while writhing under some of these periodical inflictions, we have found it difficult to regard the College in any other light than as an appendage of the State, which is supported, simply that it may be the creature of its insolent caprice, or the butt of its bigoted malignity.

It could hardly be expected, that any establishment should rise to great literary distinction, when left to its own resources, particularly, if they were narrow, or inadequate to the demands upon it: still less, under the jealous eye of a suspicious and illiberal taskmaster. The same arts, which fled before the oppression of the barbarian, returned to light under the fostering munificence of Leo; and, in every age, the enlightened patronage of the monarch has invariably called all the energies of genius into action. The lot of Maynooth College, however, has been cast in another urn. The reader will recollect the situation of British politics, at the period of its foundation,—the long series of misfortunes which had attended the British arms, the loss of the North American colonies, the gloomy aspect of Continental affairs, the still more formidable union which prevailed at home, and, above all, the gathering spirit of disaffection which, to the knowledge of the government, was spreading among all classes in Ireland. Under such circumstances, no one can mistake the soundness of the policy, which sought, by concessions to the Catholic party, at once to secure a claim to their gratitude, and excite the jealousy of their Presbyterian confederates. But, if the desire of securing the gratitude of the Catholic party were sincere, it is to be regretted, that the kindly policy, which prompted the boon in the first instance, was defeated by the cold indifference which left the young Institution to contend, unassisted, with the difficulties inseparable

from its early labours, and the virulent opposition which it encountered from every quarter. All its movements were observed with suspicion—its loyalty on the one hand, its sincerity on the other. Its energies were cramped by this perpetual surveillance. Improvements, from time to time, becoming necessary or desirable, were left untried, for want of means to make the experiment. Once, indeed, under the administration of the Duke of Bedford, £5000 were voted for the execution of some projected improvement. But the hope inspired by this indulgence was again blasted—the application for a renewal of this grant was unsuccessful; and the College, although confessedly incompetent to supply the wants of the Catholic Mission of Ireland, has been suffered to struggle on, with the same inadequate resources. Hence, the original bounty of Parliament, inconsiderable as it was, has been in part diverted from its primitive purpose. The funds, allotted for the education of the candidates for the priesthood, were necessarily, as the numbers began to encrease, employed in erecting new buildings for their reception; and it is a positive fact, that the extensive pile of building, in which the students of Maynooth are now accommodated, has been raised by the hard-wrought economy of years, from the narrow means doled out annually by government. Even supposing, therefore, that, in the practical details of the Collegiate system, anything objectionable should be discovered, it is easy to see to whom the deficiency is to be attributed. If more has not been done, the fault lies with those whose bigotry has been a drag-chain on the liberality or justice of the legislature; and, far from exposing, they should rather fling their mantle over, defects, which are, indisputably, of their own creation.

But it is time to turn to the pamphlets. From a sort of apathy which we have often had occasion to observe, where a body, not individuals, was concerned, no notice seems to have been taken of them, by any member of the establishment thus violently assailed. Indeed, few would be willing to lower themselves into collision with the scurrility which characterizes the latter of the two. At home, where the circumstances of the case, and the real character of the Institution are known, this silence produces comparatively little mischief. But, at a distance from the source of information, many may be destitute of the means, many also of the inclination, to investigate the truth; and this, therefore, no less than the tone of cool, unblushing assurance, in which the charges against the College are put forward, must be our apology for devoting some pages of the present number to their examination.

One word before we proceed farther, with regard to the degree

of credit due to the statements contained in "Maynooth in 1834." The alleged author was a student of the College for somewhat more than a year-and-a-half; having passed through the Christmas and Summer Terms of the Rhetoric, and the Christmas Term of the Logic, year. At the end of this short course, the details of which were very unpromising, he was expelled from the College; and seems to have employed the period which has since elapsed, in seeking redress, or, more properly, revenge, having appealed to the Lord Lieutenant, to the Visitors, to the Parliament, and, in several forms, to the public at large. Under any circumstances, a statement coming from such a quarter, should be received with suspicion. If, however, the writer had possessed tact enough, to adopt a tone of moderation, and consider well how far he might push his accusation, without destroying all semblance of probability; if he had not, by the looseness of his argument, no less than the virulence of his invective, stamped upon the motives of his protégé undoubted evidence of an anxiety to abuse, rather than to examine, to gratify personal feelings, rather than to give the public a credible statement of abuses which called for correction, he might have gone a good way in disarming this natural distrust, and secured some chance of a patient reading, if not of sympathy, for his imagined wrongs. But, as it is, we conceive it impossible that any man, no matter how bigoted, should read even a few pages, without seeing through the flimsy veil which has been flung over his motives, and which, flimsy as it is, was adopted in this second edition, as the reader will remember, only "in deference to the punctilious judgment" of the Orange publishers of Dublin! The writer, indeed, who had the boldness to charge the whole body of Superiors and Professors with deliberate perjury, and the no less odious crime, subornation of perjury,\* cannot be expected to feel much delicacy with regard to the less statutable offences of ignorance and intolerance: and it would be idle, indeed, to look for much regard to truth in one, who is unblushing enough to represent the whole body of students, as lost so completely to every feeling of honour and moral dignity, that "he never knew a dangerous syllable dropped in the presence of *three* students, of which the Dean did not gain cognizance."†—Even in mere matters of fact, he has not taken the trouble to guard against obvious and palpable contradictions. He decides, for example, as from his own knowledge,‡ on the merits of Professors whose classes, even from his own account, he never could have attended: he expresses his opinions of lectures, at which he never was present;

\* Pp. 8-9.

† P. 40.

‡ P. 53.



perverts, or misquotes statutes, with which every one connected with the College is acquainted; and represents the Vice-President as holding the chair of Scripture, which, had he felt any concern for accuracy, he might easily have ascertained to be untrue! Altogether, we have seldom seen a book which better deserves the epigram, written for the once notorious Sir Nathaniel Wraxall—

\* Men, measures, seasons, scenes, and facts all,  
Misquoting, misstating,  
Misplacing, misdating,

Here lies —————

How unfortunate for the poor young man, that he entrusted the “making up of his materials” to persons who have manifested so little consideration for his character for veracity! We have introduced the pamphlet, therefore, into this paper, not because we conceive it possesses any individual weight, but because the charges which it puts forward—to some extent, indeed, divested of their gross and clumsy character—have been adopted, and retailed, by other writers of more art, though scarcely of more candour, than the author of “Maynooth in 1834.”

The arrangement, at least, whatever may be its other merits, of “the case of Maynooth College considered,” is orderly and methodical; and, feeling satisfied that the best defence of the College is a plain statement of its entire system, we shall extract, or condense the account given by this writer, hostile though he be, adding only such observations, as may be casually suggested, or called forth by his not unfrequent misrepresentations. The pamphlet is divided into three parts;—a history of the circumstances which led to the foundation of the College; an account of the system of education pursued in it; and a review of the effect it has produced upon the character of the Catholic Clergy of Ireland. The first part, as regarding a period anterior to the foundation of the College, has no reference to its present character. Although, therefore, the statements contained in it are somewhat loose and inaccurate, we shall not stop to examine it; but proceed at once to the second, which details the system of education. The following is the author’s account of the discipline and government of the College:—

“The superintendence and instruction of the students are committed to the following Officers and Professors:—the President, Vice-President, Senior and Junior Dean, Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, Bursar, three Professors of Theology, a Professor of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew, one of Natural, and one of Moral Philosophy, one of Rhetoric, one of Humanity, one of English Elocution and French, and one of Irish.

"The College is governed by statutes, drawn up by the Trustees, and submitted to the approval of the Lord Lieutenant. These were first compiled and published in the year 1800. They were afterwards altered and enlarged in the year 1820. The former are to be found in the Parliamentary papers relative to Maynooth, printed in 1808: the latter are given in the appendix to the eighth report of the Commissioners in the year 1826. There is also a 'Rule of Piety and of Domestic Discipline,' which is in a great measure taken from the laws of the Irish College at Rome, the Collegium Ludovicinum.

"To the President is committed the general inspection of the whole establishment. It is his office to see that all the subordinate teachers are attentive to the discharge of their several duties. The power of expelling students for offences against the statutes is lodged in him. He, also, on consulting with the Vice-President and Deans, determines concerning the candidates for holy orders. And, at the meetings of the Board of the Trustees, he reports to them the state of the entire college. The salary annexed to this situation is £326 a-year: the Reverend M. Montague now holds the office. He was educated in the College, and has never left it.

"The Vice-President's duty is to assist the President in his general inspection of the students, and, when he is absent, or unable by illness to discharge his duties, to act as his substitute, with the same powers. His salary is £150 a-year.

"To the Senior and Junior Deans is committed the immediate superintendence of the discipline of the College; they attend to the morals, and watch the dispositions and conduct, of the students: they assist at the spiritual exercises of the community, and generally conduct what is technically termed the 'Spiritual Retreat,' which takes place twice in the year; once, early in September, and again at the period of ordination. The Retreat lasts for five days, during the whole of which period, a silence, for the purpose of religious meditation, is observed by the students, and exhortations are given to them by one of the Deans, on the peculiar virtues becoming the clerical office. One of the Deans also usually accompanies the students in their public walks; and, in fact, they have the charge of the students, while not attending the lectures of their Professors. The Senior Dean receives £122 a-year: the Junior £112."—pp. 30-32.

"The students rise at five in the summer, and at six in the winter, months. They assemble in chapel for morning prayer, after which they pursue their studies till eight, at which hour they attend mass. They then breakfast; and are at liberty to amuse themselves until half past nine; from that time, they prosecute their studies until half past ten, when they assemble in the different lecture rooms, and attend the Professors for one hour; after which, half an hour is set apart for recreation. At twelve, study is resumed for two hours; from two till three, they attend their several lectures: they then dine, and are at liberty to amuse themselves until five. Their studies, either in private or in class, are then resumed, and are continued until eight, when another hour is set apart for recreation. At nine they assemble for the night prayer;

after which, they retire to their respective rooms, and are required to be in bed at ten o'clock. Wednesdays and Saturdays may be considered as half holidays.

"The students are required to maintain silence during the hours of study, of lecture, and of meals, and also from the time of night prayer, when they retire to their rooms, until after morning prayer of the ensuing day. The hours of recreation, rather less than four in each day, are those only in which they are at full liberty to speak, during five days of the week. On Wednesdays and Saturdays, and other occasional vacant days, the liberty of speaking is less restricted. During the 'Spiritual Retreat,' an unbroken silence is observed for five days. At these periods the time is generally spent in prayer, in spiritual reading, in exercises of piety, and in attending to spiritual instructions, which are given to the students in the chapel. A portion of the day is allowed for exercise, during which the students walk in solitary contemplation. A subject for meditation is given out on each day, and is explained generally by the conductor of the Retreat, on the day following. The subjects are such as relate to the duties of clergymen; piety and moral duties, the observance of order, and the preparation for administering the rites and sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church.

"In preserving, or enforcing discipline, the ordinary mode of proceeding is as follows:—Any student neglecting his duty, or habitually violating any of the rules of the College, is cited before the President, who privately admonishes him. If he is found to repeat the offence, he is in like manner admonished a second, and a third time; and if, after the third admonition, he is found not to amend his conduct, he is liable to be removed from the College. There are other considerations, however, influencing the minds of the students, particularly the fear of exclusion from orders, which operates more powerfully in maintaining discipline, than any punishment to which the superiors of the house resort." pp. 49-51.

Taking the report even of an enemy, we can see nothing in all this deserving of reprobation. On the contrary, we can scarcely imagine a course better calculated to form those habits of labour and self denial, which all must admit to be the portion of the Irish Priest; or to foster that spirit of virtue and piety, without which the clerical profession is a curse in the land. And yet this is the discipline of which the world has heard so much, and against which so many charges have been made. It has been represented as intolerably severe—calculated to debase and illiberalize the mind, by the unbroken, and monkish silence which it imposes; rendering the College, in truth, the very counterpart of Petrarch's

"Albergo di dolor, madre d'errori:—

Its government too has been "denounced as arbitrary in the last degree," and "supported by a system of espionage," which has, in fact, made it "an inquisition in the heart of a free coun-

try." But in justice to the author before us, it must be acknowledged that he has little share in this representation. It has been made by others; yet as the public have heard the charge, we deem it right that they should be made acquainted with the refutation, which every one, who knows any thing of the College, could supply.

We should hardly, indeed, have imagined, that so tender an interest was taken in the comfort of the Catholic Clergy, or of the candidates for that much abused office. It is complained, that the system just detailed, the regulations for rising, study, confinement, &c. are unreasonably severe. And then the silence—the cold comfortless silence! Considerate souls! It is too much to require from those, whose portion for life will be to discharge all the functions of a most laborious ministry; to spend six, or eight, or ten hours in unbroken attendance to the duties of the confessional; to rise at every hour of the night, in every season of the year, and every state of the weather, and travel through the pelting storm, to tender the consolations of religion at the bed of disease and death; in one word, to tread one continued round of labour, the more irksome, perhaps, because silent and unostentatious—it is too much to require of such men, during their preparatory course, that, after eight hours of the refreshing sleep which a laborious student can always command, they shall rise, during the winter months at six, and the summer months at five, o'clock—that, for nine months in the year, on four days in each week (for "Wednesdays and Saturdays may be considered as half holidays") they shall devote to the studies of their profession, in summer eight hours, and in winter seven, so arranged and distributed that the confinement shall never exceed two continuous hours!

Some poppy-headed students, indeed, may consider this too much; but there is no man that ever laboured for eminence in any profession, who will not agree with us in pronouncing it a moderate, if not a luxurious, average of study. As to the silence, we think the propriety of observing it strictly, during the hours of study, devotion, and, above all, of sleep, so obvious, that we shall content ourselves with recommending the students of Maynooth College, to employ the "unquiet little member" usefully, during their four hours of daily recreation, their vacant days, their half holidays, and their vacations, confident that, at all the other periods, it will be, at least negatively, well employed, "working no evil."

The Collegiate government is represented as despotic.—The enforcement of discipline is committed to the President, Vice President and assisting superiors; but they are controlled by

what appears to us an admirable code of statutes; and every act is subject to the surveillance and reversal of higher powers. On this subject, we will give our readers an opportunity of forming some idea of the temper which pervades all the charges, from the examination of one of the capital grounds of complaint, namely, that "the President has usurped the power of expelling a member of the College, by his own authority; whereas it is expressly provided by the Statute, that he should consult the council of professors, and superiors before he proceeds to the last extremity, *ita ut ne maximam pœnam ipse solus inferat*."\* There could not, perhaps, be a clearer instance of bad faith, than is displayed in this accusation; for the very sentence of the statute, from which the last clause is extracted, vests the disputed power in the person of the President.

"Fraudi maximæ obnoxios exauctorato; absque capitali fraude si quid vel criminis admissum erit, vel prætermisum officii, cui rei cognoscendæ, coercendæque, alium neminem præfecerimus, penes hunc culpæ æstimatio judicatioque remaneto; ita tamen ut ne maximam pœnam solus inferat." Cap. ii. s. iv. "

Or as it occurs in the authorized translation given in the appendix, (p. 23.)

"Let him expel those guilty of offences, to which the penalty of expulsion is annexed by the statutes; should any crime be committed, or any neglect of duty occur, not enumerated among those offences which are punished by the statutes with expulsion, and for the cognizance and punishing of which we may have appointed no other person, be it his province to estimate and judge the offence, with this restriction, however, that he do not of himself alone inflict the highest penalty."

Hence, then, it is evident, that the power of the president to expel the refractory, instead of being usurped, as this writer would persuade us, is expressly recognized by the very statute to which he has appealed; and that the restricting clause, brought forward to support his accusation, is applicable solely to those doubtful cases, in which the penalty of expulsion has not been awarded by the statutes.—When men can thus venture to mutilate and pervert a public document, can we expect that they will be honest in statements of fact, where the terror of the "littera scripta" is wanting, to operate as a check on misrepresentation?

If it were necessary to argue farther, there is one plain and striking fact, which may set the question completely at rest. No one can be supposed so well acquainted with the character of the College and its superiors, as the Catholic Clergy

---

\* Maynooth in 1834, p. 25.

of Ireland, who have been educated within its walls, and witnessed, for years, all the workings of its Government. It is well known that the power of a Bishop over his Clergy is very extensive, and altogether of a character, which no man, particularly when he himself comes under its jurisdiction, would place in the hands of one, whom he knew to be a tyrant at heart, to have been nurtured in the most despotic principles, or to have given already unequivocal proofs of a tyrannical disposition. If we look round among the Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland, chosen by the very Clergy, who, if there be any truth in these representations, must be aware of this despotic and tyrannical tendency, we shall find, that no less than *twenty*, out of the *twenty-seven*, *Bishops* have been, at different periods, members of the College, and that more than one third of the whole, *including the four Archbishops*, have actually *held official situations* in "this prison-house of more than inquisitorial cruelty." Will any man of common sense, with such a fact before his eyes, believe that the picture sketched by the adversaries of Maynooth, is correct? As soon might he believe that the emancipated slaves would choose their monarchs from the most heartless and oppressive of their taskmasters.

Last of all, comes the most odious, and, certainly, the most malignant, charge of all. The College of Maynooth is "denounced as not only conniving at, but encouraging, the infamous trade of the spy and the informer, and selecting by preference, from among those who have sustained such a character, the most persevering and unprincipled, as the worthiest members of the Priesthood."\* Is it necessary for us to say, that this is false,—absolutely and entirely false? Need we point it out as another link in the chain of falsehood, which the Monks, and the Reeds, and the Grays, with their patrons and abettors, reverend, and unreverend, have laboured so long, and so assiduously in forging? We think not: its very clumsiness establishes the affinity. The calumny seems to be founded either on a misrepresentation of one of the internal arrangements, common to Maynooth with almost every extensive literary establishment,—the appointment of monitors, or prefects, to preside over a certain portion of the duties,—or on a misstatement of the power of the President in enquiring into any gross violation of discipline. The monitors "are selected from among the senior students, on the ground of superior virtue and proficiency in learning"†—and contribute to the preservation of order, rather by their presence and example, than by the slight authority which one student can be supposed to possess over another.‡ By the turbulent and discontented, it is

---

\* Ibid, p. 19.

† Statut. Collegii, c. 4. sec. 7.

‡ Append. 133.

not extraordinary, that this class should be maligned: the public, however, will see in it but little ground for the odious charge which has been founded upon it. In a large establishment, where, for a variety of reasons, the studies, during a great part of the year, are conducted in the public halls, it is obvious, that there must be some means adopted for the preservation of that order, which is essential to their success. The constant superintendence of the deans is clearly impossible; and the office of monitors or prefects is intended simply to meet the deficiency thus created—their duties are confined to the public halls, and they possess neither authority nor commission elsewhere. This is not a mere assertion: it is expressly stated in the evidence before the Commissioners. In answer to the question, “on what occasions, and in what manner, do they assist in enforcing the discipline?” it is distinctly stated, (p. 130) “They return to the deans the names of the persons absent from morning and night prayer. When the students assemble, in the winter season, in the halls, two of them are appointed to *preserve order in the hall*; and in the class of theology, there are persons appointed by the professor also to return to the professors the names of those that do not attend.” And when the question was farther urged, “whether they did not exercise *considerable superintendence*?” the answer was, “*not farther than I have stated*: they return to the dean the names of persons absent from prayer in the morning; and, at night, if they found any one absent from the study, during the winter season, they would return their names.”—In like manner, the power which the president possesses, is as reasonable as it is necessary. The civil magistrate can compel a witness to disclose, upon oath, the crime of his fellow citizen—the Church of England, in the publication of the banns, directs her minister to proclaim the solemn obligation of declaring any “cause or just impediment, why the parties should not be joined in holy matrimony”—and our Redeemer has given the same precept in the remarkable words of the 18th chapter of St. Matthew: “If he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand; and if he will not hear them, tell the Church.” Founded upon the same principle, and analogous to the authority of the Civil Magistrate, in examining any violation of the civil law, a power is vested in the President, of summoning before him any member of the “*Familia Academica*,” and requiring evidence on any matter, which he deems of sufficient importance to warrant so summary a proceeding. It is in accordance with the spirit of the Roman ceremonial, and the practice, observed from the earliest times, of examining rigorously into the character of the candidates for holy orders. The ab-

surdity of the charge, into which these facts have been distorted, will appear from the same plain, common-sense argument, which we have already used, and which applies, with even more force, to this case. Will any man believe, that the Clergy of Ireland, educated at Maynooth, and therefore fully cognizant of the machinery by which its government is directed, would place over themselves a superior, invested with almost absolute authority, whom they knew to have been long initiated in all the mysteries of this odious and degraded system of espionage? That they would knowingly and unanimously choose, not in one instance, but in twenty, a man from whose prying eye, unrestrained "by any principle of honour or courtesy," they could not hope to cover their most secret conversation, and scarcely calculate on security, even in the privacy of their homes, or under the sacred guard of confidential communication? It is too absurd, to impose even upon the most undistinguishing credulity.

We have often been surprised at the total forgetfulness of principle, which characterises many of the charges against Catholics and Catholic institutions. Who would believe that the very principle, which is here made the subject of so gross a charge against Maynooth College, was recognised and applied in the public acts of the English and Scottish churches. In the liturgy of the Church of England, in the ceremony of the "ordering of deacons," after the archdeacon, in reply to the charge of the bishop, that he "take heed that the candidates whom he presents be apt and meet for learning and godly conversation," has declared, "that he has *enquired* of them and examined them, and thinks them so to be," the bishop proclaims aloud to those present, "Brethren, if there be any of you who knoweth any impediment, or notable crime in any of these persons presented to be ordered as deacons, for the which he should not be admitted to that office, let him come forth in the name of the Lord, and *show what the crime or impediment is.*" In the ordering of the priests, a similar passage occurs: and in the "form of Presbyterial church government agreed upon by the divines at Westminster," it is ruled that the presbytery is to "*enquire touching the grace of God in him, (the candidate for the ministry) whether he be of such holiness of life as is requisite for a minister of the gospel.*"\* Nor is this power of enquiring confined to the candidates for the ministry: it is extended to each and every member of the Presbyterial body. "The ruling officers of a particular congregation have power *authoritatively to call before them* any member of the congregation as they shall see



just occasion, to *enquire* into the knowledge and *spiritual estate* of *the several members of the congregation*.\*

The system of education pursued at Maynooth has been most virulently attacked. In entering upon this subject, we would submit, that nothing can be more absurd than to set up the same standard of education for all young men, no matter what the profession to which they are destined. If the object of education be to prepare men for the due performance of the part in life which they have chosen for themselves, and, as the word implies, to *develope* their faculties in reference to that object, it is clear that both its manner and its matter should vary with the calling of the individual student. Nothing could be more mistaken, than to bestow the same instruction on the several students of medicine, of law, and of divinity,—to form by the same rules, and the cultivation of the same sciences, the youth, whose manhood is to be spent in the enjoyment of literary ease, or the pursuit of abstract but profane knowledge, and him, whose life is destined to active and laborious employment among the poor and uninstructed—to the exposition of the simple truths of religion, and the equally simple doctrines of morality. The preparatory studies, as far as they tend to the improvement of the mind, and the general development of its powers, may be the same for all: but a *professional* education, at least, should take its tone from the profession to which it is devoted. The notion, that learning consists in an acquaintance with classical authors, or a familiarity with abstruse sciences, has long since been exploded. As long as the modern languages of Europe remained without cultivation, and the literature of Greece and Rome was the principal repository of liberal knowledge, the opinion was just and well founded. The ignorant admiration, however, of those who had no claim to the character of learning, or the flattered pride of those who had, contributed to give it currency, even after the reason, which justified it, had ceased to exist. But, examined without prejudice, nothing can appear more ridiculous. The true and useful learning of the physician, is the science of pathology and medicine—of the lawyer, the theory and practice of law—of the clergyman, the moral duties and speculative doctrines of Christianity. Give us, in an ecclesiastical education, a solid and accurate acquaintance with the truths of religion, and the substantial knowledge necessary to communicate them with advantage. We care little for the rest—we look upon it only as preparatory, or at least subsidiary, to the main design. Classical and scientific studies are not here an *end*;—indeed they should

not be so in any profession,—they are but a part of the means, to that which is of real importance. Hence, although they should not be altogether neglected, it is neither necessary nor expedient, that they should be cultivated to the same extent as in a course of education, the object of which is purely literary. This care should be thrown principally upon those who have charge of the preparatory studies; so that, even if the classical studies of Maynooth were as low as its enemies would represent them, this circumstance should be attributed, not to the institution itself, but to the defective state of the public schools in the remote parts of the country, and to the difficulty, which young men of the less opulent classes experience, in procuring a liberal or refined preparatory education. For the wants of the poor a provision has been made—the rich can have recourse to the higher and more expensive schools; but the intermediate classes, debarred from the one by want of means, and from the other by a natural feeling of honest independence, are comparatively in a worse state than either.

The following general view of the classes is extracted from the account (evidently not written in a favourable spirit,) which we find in the 32d and following pages of the pamphlet before us.

“The full course of education at Maynooth occupies ten years. The studies of the first year, that is of the lowest class, are the *literæ humaniores*. According to a regulation of the trustees, no student is to be admitted into this class who is not found capable of answering in the Latin and Greek authors set down in the following entrance course:—

- |        |   |   |
|--------|---|---|
| LATIN. | { | Cæsar's Commentaries, 1st and 2d books De Bello Gallico.                |
|        |   | Sallust.  |
|        |   | Virgil's Eclogues, and 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th books of the <i>Æneid</i> . |
|        |   | Horace's Epistles.  |
|        |   | Cicero's four Orations against Cataline.                                |
| GREEK. | { | Greek Grammar.  |
|        |   | Gospel of St. John.   |
|        |   | Lucian's Dialogues,—1st book of Murphy's or Walker's.                   |
|        |   | Xenophon's <i>Cyropædia</i> ; 1st, 2d, and 3d books.                    |

“For admission into rhetoric they are required to answer in

- |        |   |  |
|--------|---|--|
| LATIN. | { | Cicero's Orations on the Manilian Law, for Archias, Milo, Marcellus, and Ligarius. |
|        |   | Livy, 1st, 2d, and 3d books.   |
|        |   | Horace's Odes and Satires.   |
|        |   | Virgil, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th books of the <i>Æneid</i> .                         |
|        |   | Juvenal, 1st, 3d, 4th, and 10th Satires.   |
| GREEK. | { | Enchiridion of Epictetus.  |
|        |   | Xenophon's <i>Anabasis</i> , 1st and 2d books.                                     |
|        |   | Homer's <i>Iliad</i> , 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th books.                                 |

“For admission into the class of logic, they are required to answer in the following, besides the authors in the two foregoing lists.

LATIN.	{	Tacitus, 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th books of the Annals.
		Livy, 4th and 5th Books.
		Cicero's Offices.
		Virgil's Georgics, and four last books of the <i>Æneid</i> .
		Horace's Art of Poetry.
GREEK.	{	Homer's Iliad, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th books.
		Demosthenes' four Philippics, and De Corona.
		Longinus De Sublimi.

\* This appears to us a very fair, if not a very liberal course. "The students are lectured twice every day, except Wednesday, Saturday, and Sunday, in Latin at morning lecture, and Greek in the afternoon." The business of the classes is not confined to the authors set down in this list; "they are exercised in the composition of Greek and Latin both in prose and verse."

"The students of the humanity and rhetoric classes attend a lecture in the evening, from five to six, by the professor of English elocution, and are practised in English composition. They also receive instruction in the catechism, called "Christian Doctrine," and in the Old Testament, on Wednesdays and Saturdays. The professor of the rhetoric class, after Christmas, generally about the month of February or March, explains to them, either from English works, which he chooses for the purpose, such as Blair's Rhetoric, or from dictates compiled by himself, the principles of rhetoric, and obliges them to compose in Latin and English. He gives them also instruction in elocution and delivery."—pp. 33, 34, 35. \*

In all the classes the same system is pursued, of stimulating the industry of the student, by requiring that, besides attending to the exposition of the professor, he shall also give an account of his private study. It is clear, however, that, following the above plan, as the public lectures occupy only nine hours in each week, it will not be possible to read *publicly* a very large number of classical authors. It is not true, however, that the actual studies "fall far short of the printed lists." Almost all the Greek is read, and sometimes more than is marked in the card, and by far the larger proportion of the Latin authors. But even though it were otherwise, we should not attach to it the very undue importance which some persons seem to think it deserves. In the education of clergymen, we should think that a knowledge of the languages, such as would enable them to pursue their private studies with advantage, should be the first object. If it be possible to combine an extensive course of classics with what those, who are best acquainted with their duties, deem the most important studies, we would gladly see it done; but if not, we have no doubt that the quantity of reading is of infinitely less importance than the manner, and we would prefer, on principle, that a young man should read, under the eye of his professor, the one

half of the authors marked down in the course, than that he should prepare the whole for an examination, without any systematic or compulsory superintendence.

"A student, at his entrance into the college, is placed, according to his proficiency, in one or other of these three classes; so that, if he be capable of answering in the books required for the class of logic, he is admitted into it at once, and his course is thereby reduced to five years instead of seven. The text book used in this class is a portion of the Lyons' Philosophy, which was reprinted for the use of the college, and some changes made in it by Dr. Anglade, who was, for some time, professor of logic, metaphysics, and ethics, at Maynooth. For each lecture, a certain portion of the text book is appointed; the professor explains any thing in it that may be obscure to the students, and they, at the following lecture, with their books closed, give an account, from memory and their intermediate study, of that portion which the professor prescribed for the matter of the lecture. The professor and students speak Latin in this class. When the students are somewhat advanced in the logic course, there is, on one day in the week, an exercise in scholastic disputation. With respect to ethics, the want of time prevents the entire course being gone through within the year."—p. 36.

This omission, however, we should suppose, cannot be of much moment, as the same course is treated much more comprehensively, in the moral theology, which all read two years afterwards.

"After a year passed in the class of logic, metaphysics, and ethics, the students are transferred to that of mathematics and natural philosophy. The text books used in this class are a Compendium of Geometry by the Abbé Darré, and the treatises by Vince and Wood, (of Cambridge) in three volumes, 8vo, which, the president informed the commissioners, the students read as far as they can."—p. 37.

The close of this extract proves that we were right in designating our author's promise "to draw information from the most authentic documents" as a *mere profession*—a show of impartiality, under which, to cover an insidious attack, rather than a sincere pledge to lay before the reader a fair and unbiassed summary of their contents. With the examinations of other witnesses he has dealt very unfairly—unwillingly acknowledging what was meritorious, and ostentatiously parading whatever he considered likely to inflict an injury on the college. But here he has gone even farther: he has misrepresented and garbled the evidence—"Which the president informed the commissioners, the students read as far as they can!" The president states most distinctly, that "the course of pure mathematics consists of arithmetic, algebra, geometry, trigonometry, both plain and spherical, and conic sections;" that "such of the students as had a peculiar turn for this study, were occasionally instructed in fluxions," that "all

read conic sections, and all, spherical trigonometry," and, in answer to the direct question, "how far in algebra the whole class proceeded," that "they read to the end of quadratic, and sometimes cubic, equations." He adds, moreover, that "they spend the remainder of the year at natural philosophy; though, in the short time, it was impossible to go through all its branches;" that "they read the laws of motion, mechanics, astronomy always, and generally either hydrostatics or optics;"\* that "they are obliged to demonstrate every proposition they go through," and that "many persons, who, at the final examination, have witnessed the progress they have made, have been surprised at the astonishing proofs, given by one-third, and often one-half, of their industry and talent for those studies." With all this definite information before him, directly under his eye, in the very page (74) from which he has quoted, the author contents himself with citing from the president's reply to the distinct question, "what book of *astronomy* they read," the words which have been given above, undefined in appearance, but determined, by their position, not to the treatises generally, for he had already given a specific answer for the greater part of them, but to the treatise of *astronomy*, which the question regarded, or, at most, of hydrostatics and optics, of which he spoke in the preceding answer. And yet, because, forsooth, the words occur *somewhere* in the president's evidence, "he has drawn his information from the most authentic sources." But there is a further instance of the same "impartial" spirit, the same anxiety to procure "satisfactory information." He had before him the examination, not only of the president, but also of fourteen or fifteen others—all men of long standing in the college—all well acquainted with the extent and arrangement of the studies in the several classes. Yet, all these he passes by, and chooses, as a test of the studies in the philosophy class, the evidence of a young man, who, as he himself explained, was appointed professor not a month before; who, for some years, had been upon the continent, utterly unconnected with the college; who knew nothing of the class, save from his impressions as student seven years previous—who had as yet conducted the

---

\* The students also receive lectures in electricity, galvanism, and, for the two last years, in electro-magnetism. The galvanic and electro-magnetic instruments are decidedly the finest we ever have seen. The galvanic apparatus, constructed on a new plan by the professor, the Rev. Doctor Callan, combines, in twenty pairs of large plates, all the advantages both of number, and extent of surface; and by the application of the electro-magnet, by means of a very ingenious instrument which he himself constructed, exhibits with a few plates all the effects in decomposition, the fusion of metals, the shock, &c., which in the ordinary batteries would require several hundred pairs of plates. There is no observatory attached to the college: indeed, considering the narrowness of the collegiate revenues, it could not be expected.

class through a very small portion of the course, and whose conscientious fears, as every line of his evidence evinces, would not suffer him to state any thing positively which he had not witnessed with his own eyes. With regard to the extent of the lectures on algebra, which he had already commenced, his testimony is definitive enough. • They comprise the four leading rules of algebra, as also involution, evolution, the use of the binomial theorem, the solution of simple and quadratic equations and problems, the principles of proportions, variations, and progressions, and the nature and use of logarithms. But beyond this all is hesitation; because, beyond this his personal knowledge as a professor extended not; and without that positive and personal knowledge, his scrupulous timidity would not suffer him to pronounce a decision. This part of the evidence, however, our “impartial” author has suppressed altogether. He turns to the lectures on astronomy, the very last in the course, which, the witness stated, “he had not taught as yet, nor would he till the close of the year;” and even this he takes care to misrepresent. He tells us, that “the professor, in reply to a question from the commissioners, stated, that he should think very few would be able to explain the principles on which an eclipse is calculated, because they are not fully explained to them; the year is at a close, at the time they are reading that part of astronomy, and therefore the professor *has not time* to explain those principles fully.” But, in the same breath, almost in the same sentence, the professor adds, “I find that some of the principles for calculating an eclipse *have been explained* to the class.” This, however, our impartial author omits. It forms no part of that “satisfactory” evidence of which he is so much enamoured,—an evidence, namely, that forwards his own views, and panders to his own prejudices.

There is an air of more than usual triumph in the tone, in which he advances the oft-repeated charge, that “the professor of mathematics had never read Euclid.” It is a charge which has been, and perhaps naturally, very much over-rated. With the ignorant, who consider a knowledge of mathematics, and an acquaintance with Euclid, as synonymous, it makes, no doubt, an imposing appearance; but no man, who knows any thing of the matter, will argue, with the author before us, that because a person “has not read the sixth book of Euclid,” he cannot be “a proficient in the abstruse department of pure mathematics.” In these countries Euclid has been generally adopted as a school-book; and those, who are acquainted with no other, may hastily conclude that a knowledge of his elements is indispensable. In France, however, it is exactly the reverse. The use of the elements has

been generally discontinued; and the most distinguished scholars at home coincide in this view. "We should form a wrong estimate," says Leslie,\* "did we consider the elements of Euclid, with all its merits, as a finished production. That admirable work was composed when geometry was making its most rapid advances, and new prospects were opening on every side. No wonder *that its structure should now appear loose and defective.*" "Whatever may be said to the contrary," says the writer of the article *Euclid* in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "it is certain that they (the Elements of Euclid) are deficient in that order, which, causing the propositions as far as possible to arise out of one another, exhibits in full evidence the analogies which connect them, assists the memory, and *prepares the mind for the investigation of truth;*"† and the *Edinburgh Encyclopædia* is "disposed to regard more modern treatises of geometry as possessing advantages unknown to Euclid; conducting the learner with greater facility to *the ulterior and more important objects of inquiry.*"‡ The short, but comprehensive course of mathematics taught at Maynooth, *where these are the principal objects proposed in the study*, follows the more concise and continuous method adopted by the Spanish mathematician, Merito Bails, in this country, by Hutton and Leslie, and in France, by almost all the modern geometricians—by Le Caille, Lacroix, Saury, Bezout, Rivard, Mazeas, and, with more success than any other, by Le Gendre. Educated at Maynooth, it was most natural that the studies of the young professor, who, be it remembered, had not yet commenced his lectures on geometry—should, in the first instance, be directed to the treatises, which, in order and arrangement, approached most closely to his own. All these circumstances, however, are studiously kept out of view, for the purpose of adding importance, in the eyes of the ignorant, to a charge against the professor, which is utterly at variance, not only with his well-known character, but also with that of several publications which we have seen with his name, both upon these subjects and upon those of electricity and galvanism.

"After four years passed in the classes described above, the students are transferred to the class of divinity, the most important in the course of education.

"In the class of divinity the students remain for three years, which completes the full course of instruction given in the college. There are three professors of divinity, and nine hours in the week are occupied in their lectures. The text books consist of ten volumes; five of dog-

---

\* Preface, page iv.

† Encyclop. Brit., Art Euclid. New edition, part 50, page 391.

‡ Vol. ix. p. 222.

matic theology, compiled by Dr. Delahogue,\* who had been for many years a professor at Maynooth, and five of moral theology, written by Bailly, a French divine, and professor of theology at Dijon."

Of the theological course there are two principal divisions—speculative and moral. In the first are discussed all the doctrinal questions controverted between Catholics and their opponents of every class, whether infidel or sectarian; the nature and history of the dispute is explained, the arguments for the Catholic opinion stated, and the objections methodically detailed and refuted. The second treats of the principles of action, conscience, the nature and obligation of laws, the decalogue, the nature and efficacy of the sacraments, and the dispositions with which they may be received with advantage, &c. This course is the longest, as well as the most important of the whole; and, as no portion of the collegiate studies has been so violently attacked, it would be strange if our pamphleteer did not, at last, fling off his disguise, and join in the ignorant outcry. He does not, indeed, go so far as to style it, with some of his contemporaries, a system of "*savage heathenism*;" nor does he seek, with others, to fix upon the college the opinions of the celebrated Dens, whose theology, so far from being taught or recommended, was formally rejected, when proposed as a class-book, many years since. But the moderation, which he usually affects, deserts him here, and he consequently manifests more of bigotry, and, we must add, less of good faith, than in any other portion of his pages.

A necessary appendage of the practice of confession, and one which must stand or fall by the same arguments, is the obligation by which every clergyman, who undertakes the duty, is bound to learn something of the mysteries of the human heart, that he may know the maladies to which it is subject, their causes, symptoms, preventives, and remedies. It is too late for the surgeon or physician, when a case occurs in which decision is of the last importance, to sit down and examine its nature, and the proper treatment to be applied. He must have laid up beforehand the knowledge necessary for every case which may present itself; and no one will say, that he should be deterred from this indispensable preparation, by the nature of the subjects to which his attention must occasionally be directed. On the same principle, a small portion of the treatises of theology—but a few pages, out of ten volumes which contain four or five thousand—is devoted to certain explanations, which may become necessary in the discharge of the ordinary duties of the clergyman. It

---

\* These treatises have been reprinted in France, as also at Frankfort, for the use of seminaries. (App. p. 76.) They are in very general use in all the Catholic colleges in America.



is scarcely possible to devise a system of discipline, better calculated, not merely to place a temporary restraint upon the passions, but to form permanent habits of solid virtue, than that which is pursued at Maynooth, even as it is represented by this writer.\* The purifying seclusion of collegiate life, the absence of every object which could lead to evil, and the presence of all that can fill the heart with the love of good; the recollection, which all the duties conspire to keep alive, of the obligations attached to the sacred ministry; the stated periods of self-examination, and the practice of the best of all devotions—the devotion of the heart,—all these tend, of their own nature, to produce impressions which can never be effaced—which must constitute, at once the happiness, and the security of the clergyman—relieving the irksomeness of his own labours, and diffusing the blessings of Heaven within the sphere of his ministry. The very character, therefore, and obligations of the student, the sacred sense of duty from which alone it is pursued, and the veil which is thrown over the subject by the unknown language in which it is discussed, are a sufficient security against any danger, which might otherwise be apprehended, from a study, whose sole object here is the preservation of virtue. It is clear that its character is essentially altered, when the details are presented through the medium of a gross and revolting translation, or accompanied by a disgusting commentary. But it should be remembered, that many passages of the Old Testament, and, in particular, the books of Deuteronomy and Leviticus, which the Protestant practice places, without any disguise of language, in the hands of all, without distinction of age or character, are susceptible of, and *have actually suffered*, similar perversion at the hands of the infidel and the blasphemer. We will not trust ourselves to speak of the wretches, who have ~~tanked~~ tasked their bad ingenuity, in order to present these things to the public in their most offensive form; for we are ashamed to apply to them the language which their infamous labours but too well justify. But is it not astonishing that such men should pretend to the character of guardians of morality? Nay, that they should have found persons simple enough not to see through the shallowness of their professions?

The surest test of principle is experience. If the doctrines inculcated at Maynooth, and adopted by the Irish Catholic clergy, be really what interested slanderers would represent them; if they be in any way subversive of the principles of justice or morality, how, we would ask, does it happen, that, in

these very virtues, the morality of the Irish Catholics, as their worst enemies admit, is of so exalted an order? How does it happen, that among the instances of injustice, which must occur in every community, we find examples of restitution, through the hands of this very clergy, so frequent and so considerable? not confined by any of the rules which this silly writer misunderstands, or misrepresents, but embracing alike pence, and shillings, and pounds, and hundreds of pounds? Can the pretended immoral tendency of the Maynooth theology be borne out by a comparison of Irish female virtue, with that of Protestant England, where "those principles are not sanctioned?" We will not sully our pages by pointing to examples of profligacy in every class, from the pauper to the peer. We will not enumerate, for we cannot, the instances, or the causes, of divorce and separation. But we turn, with pride and thanksgiving, to the untarnished virtue of our own despised country—untarnished in private, as in public life—sacred from the calumnies of the worst slanderers of Catholic Ireland. When has the Catholic wife followed a married seducer from the side of her husband, and that Catholic husband manifested his delicate sense of the injury, by—*marrying the wife of the unprincipled destroyer of his honour?* Thank Heaven "such things are not even named" among us—thank Heaven, we can appeal, as the best defence of the principle and practice of confession, to the fact, with which all—Protestants and Catholics—are acquainted, and of which every circle of Catholic society will furnish examples, that among Catholic females, proverbially virtuous as they are, that female is the most virtuous, the most modest, and the most edifying, who approaches most frequently to the sacred tribunal of confession. This is not a character of our own making; it is acknowledged by all; it strikes every one, the stranger, no less than the native, the Protestant alike with the Catholic. From a crowd of testimonies within our reach, we select one from the well known observations on *Ireland and its Economy*, by J. E. Bicheno, Esq., written at a period when, if ever, these principles must have produced their full effect upon the morals of the people. The writer is a Protestant, and *thinks it necessary to offer an apology* "if he has spoken in an excusatory tone of the Catholics."

"The Catholic population of Ireland owe a debt of gratitude to their pastors, which time can never efface. The *inviolability of the marriage vow*, the *chastity of their females*, the affection between children and parents, the charity of the poor to the still poorer, and generally the fulfilment of the social duties, are virtues for which the Irish are conspicuously eminent; and I will not stay to calculate how much they have been the result of a peculiar economy, and how much we must abate from the

power of religion. *There can be no doubt, that, without the wholesome controul of the Church, these virtues would have shrunk into a diminutive compass, while the vices, to which the people are addicted, would have swollen to a fearful magnitude; and if the priests had been deprived of their influence, as some persons would advise, WOULD HAVE UTTERLY LAID WASTE THE COUNTRY.*"\*

But it is time to give a specimen of the spirit in which these charges are put forward.

"In Dr. Delahogue's treatise on *The Church*, the second proposition, p. 17, is in these words: 'schismatics, even though they err not in doctrine, by the mere fact of their schism, are excluded from the Church, and are *out of the pale of salvation*.'† By a variety of arguments Dr. Delahogue endeavours to establish this position, and to show that, whatever may be said to the contrary, the schismatic, although he may not err in doctrine, is not a member of that one Church 'out of which' (Catholics) believe that 'no salvation can be hoped for.' He then proceeds to lay down his third proposition, p. 41, 'the *society of Protestants cannot clear itself from the guilt of schism, thereby excluding every individual Protestant from all hope of salvation; FOR a society, as distinguished from the persons composing it, is not capable of being excluded from the hope of eternal salvation.* One might have thought that there was bigotry enough in condemning all, who are not in communion with the Roman Catholic Church, to perdition in a future state, but to this is added intolerance with respect to the present life. 'The Church,' asserts the Maynooth professor, 'retains her jurisdiction over all apostates, heretics, and *schismatics*, although they no longer appertain to her body, just as a military officer has a right of decreeing *severer punishments* against a soldier who deserts, even though his name may have been erased from the military roll.'"

The reader will smile at the silliness of the logic which is here put forward with so much confidence and ostentation. We will not, however, undertake to define what his feelings will be, when he has learned, that, of the two passages or propositions, which our "moderate" and "impartial" author has quoted with such a flourish, one *actually contains*, and the other *expressly refers to*, an explanation of the *nature* of heresy, which he did not think "satisfactory" enough to be laid before his readers, because it completely destroys the precious argument which he was constructing.‡ In pages 39 and 40, while explaining this *identical second proposition*, Dr. Delahogue writes,—

\* Pages 193, 194.

† Did this writer ever read the 18th of the Articles of the Church of England? If so, why put these words in italics?

‡ The writer proceeds:—"One is naturally anxious to learn, what are those '*severer punishments*' to which we are exposed. The commissioners inquired into their nature from Dr. Slevin, who was prefect of the Dunboyne establishment. He assured them that they were merely spiritual censures. But, after having already ex-

"It is a very different thing to say, that 'out of the true Church there is no hope of salvation,' and, that 'all will be damned who, during life were not of the *visible body* (de corpore) of the Church;' for all theologians enumerate very many persons, who, although attached externally to heretical or schismatical societies, belong to the soul of the true Church, who adhere to the heresy or schism, from invincible ignorance of its nature, and consequently will be saved, unless other actual transgressions, unremitted by contrition or the sacraments, interfere to prevent it. And even with regard to those, who have actually died in the profession of heresy or schism, and for whose attachment to it during life we can discover no excuse, as no one on earth can pronounce on their dispositions, so none can say that they are of the number of the reprobate. Their fate must be left to the judgment of God."

And yet we are gravely told that Dr. Delahogue "excludes every individual Protestant from salvation!" To make the total want of faith still more apparent, we need only direct attention to the words which *immediately precede* the second quotation, p. 404. "Public heretics or schismatics, though they be not of the body (or external society) of the Church, may, if they labour under invincible ignorance, belong to its soul (or the society of those who, in the sight of God, are true believers). *Vide supra*, p. 40"—the very passage quoted above! "Oh! ye sons of men! how long will ye be dull of heart? how long will ye love vanity and seek after lies?" Will the Protestants of these countries never open their eyes to the designs of men, whose trade is deceit, and who, subsisting on their prejudices, stop at no means of keeping them alive, if it be but for a moment?

The late declaimers against Popish intolerance have been repeatedly taxed with inconsistency, in making a charge to which their own principles were exposed. We cannot refrain from opening, as we pass, some of the documents whose authority every churchman must acknowledge, and placing by the side of "the intolerant class-books of Maynooth," which this author makes (p. 84) a ground for the suspension of the parliamentary grant, a few specimens of the "blessed toleration" of that Church, to the support of which so many hundred thousands of the public money are annually applied. To some the task may appear gratuitous. It may seem idle to search in books, for the cha-

---

*communicated* schismatics, one remains at a loss to discover any severer *spiritual* censure that the Church can devise." If he had not suppressed the very next answer, neither he, nor his reader, could have the smallest difficulty in discovering it. "All those who culpably separate from the Church incur that censure; after their separation they are considered to sin as often as they knowingly and wilfully violate the laws, and to incur any spiritual penalty annexed to their transgressions." In this short passage, therefore, there are no less than three tangible misrepresentations of the class-books.

acter which is written in letters of blood upon every page of her history,—in the furious and unrelenting persecutions of the Catholics, and the more anomalous, if less persevering, oppression of the Protestant dissenters. With the former every reader is familiar: the latter is indignantly proclaimed by the able and consistent author of the well-known “*Dissent from the Church of England.*”

“Have you never read, with a bleeding heart, the unrelenting rigours of your archbishops Parker, Bancroft, Whitgift, Laud, under the first of whom above a hundred, under the second above three hundred, pious and learned men, not only members but ministers of your Church, were silenced, suspended, admonished, deprived, many of them loaded with grievous and heavy fines, and shut up in filthy gaols, where they slowly expired through penury and want? . . . Have you never read, sir, what desolation Laud brought upon your fathers, whilst yet in your Church? How many hundreds of them were sequestered, driven from their livings, excommunicated, persecuted in the High Commission Court, and forced to leave the kingdom for not punctually conforming to all the ceremonies and rites? . . . In consequence of these unrighteous acts, were not vast numbers of pious clergymen, our forefathers, once the glory of your Church, with multitudes of their people, laid in prisons amongst thieves and common malefactors, where they suffered the greatest hardships, indignities, and oppressions? their houses were cruelly rifled, their goods made a prey to hungry informers, and their families given up to beggary and want. An estimate was published of *near eight thousand* Protestant dissenters who had perished in prison, in the reign only of Charles II. By severe penalties, inflicted on them for assembling to worship God, they suffered in their trade and estates, in the compass of a few years, to the amount of at least two millions; and a list of sixty thousand persons was taken, who had suffered, on a religious account, betwixt the Restoration and the Revolution.”\*

This is truly an appalling picture of intolerance, and of the most cruel and anomalous of all—Protestant intolerance. “Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing”—the same principle proclaims the freedom of conscience, and rewards its exercise with—death. And yet, difficult as it may be to reconcile the fact with the late outcry against the intolerant principles of Catholicity, it is but too faithful a copy of the spirit which breathes through all the constitutions of the Church of England—in her book of Homilies, in her Liturgy of the gunpowder treason, and of King Charles the Martyr, in her canons ecclesiastical, in her acts of convocation, and, more than all, in the barbarous penal code, which her prelates were the first to

---

\* Pages 85, 86, 87, Second Letter.

sanction, and the last to repeal. The nerves of our sensitive pamphleteer quake with apprehension of the time when the spirit of Catholicity in Ireland shall be supported by the arm of the civil authorities. What would he say if the "Maynooth professor" proclaimed to his pupils, that it was not only the right, but actually the duty, of the Godly magistrate, to enter the conventicle of Protestantism, to tear down the reading desk and pulpit, to overturn the Communion table, deface and dismantle the entire building? And what *will* he say, when he finds that the homilies,\* of which every clergyman, when he subscribes to the 35th article, declares, that they "*contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for those times,*" actually assign to the righteous magistrate the duty, as they attribute to him the power, of tearing down the images in the Catholic churches, defacing the paintings and statues of our Redeemer and his apostles, and controlling, by the sword of the flesh, the free exercise of the first principle of Protestantism? When he finds that the same, or a similar authority and obligation, are attributed to the churchwardens, by the 97th. canon ecclesiastical? When, he finds—far from this code remaining a dead letter—a Godly archbishop taking the place of the Godly Magistrate,† "quitting his province, the public service of the Church, on a solemn festival, heading a file of musketeers, leading them on furiously to demolish a chapel, apprehend a few priests, and terrify a number of harmless people in the midst of their devotions;" looking on and encouraging the literal fulfilment of the precept enforced in the homily—while the soldiers‡ "seized the priest in his vestments at the altar ..... took away the crucifixes and paraments of the altar, hewed down the image of St. Francis, and delivered the priests and friars into the hands of the pursuivants.§" This is toleration with a witness! But this is a subject which might easily make us forget the narrowness of our limits. We shall submit, therefore, without any commentary, a few passages, which display but too clearly the spirit of the Church of England.

By the act of uniformity it is enacted, among other penalties, that "if any shall declare, or speak any thing in derogation, or depraving, of the book of Common Prayer, or any thing therein contained, or any part thereof, he shall, for the first offence, suffer imprisonment for one whole year, without bail or main-prize; and for the second, imprisonment during life."

\* Pages 197 and 270. London, 1825. "Homily against Peril of Idolatry."

† See "Narrative of Hammon L'Estrange," quoted by Currie, vol. i. p. 115, and by Taaffe, vol. ii. p. 319.

‡ Plowden, vol. i. p. 116. § Taaffe, vol. ii. p. 319.

The third canon, in reference to the same book of Common Prayer, enacts,—“If any person shall preach, or by other open words declare, or speak, anything in the derogation, or despising of the said book, or any thing therein contained, *let him be excommunicated*, and not restored, until he repent, and publicly revoke his error.” The fourth, by a similar denunciation, cuts short all freedom of *private judgment*, with regard to the “book of the ordering of bishops, priests, and deacons;” and the fifth, with one sweeping sentence, consistent, because undistinguishing, suffers not one, *who is not a member of the Church of England*, to breathe within the realm, *without incurring all the penalties implied\* in the sentence of excommunication*,—privation of the society of Christians, *utter civil disability*, and even liability, on the representation of the bishop, to *imprisonment in the common jail*, until the error shall have been publicly retracted. “If any shall affirm, or maintain, that there are, within this realm, *other meetings, assemblies, and congregations, than such as, by the laws of this land, are held and allowed*, which may challenge to themselves *the name of TRUE AND LAWFUL CHURCHES*, LET HIM BE EXCOMMUNICATED, and not restored until he repent, and publicly revoke his error.” And yet, severe as are the penalties here annexed to the *crime* of non-conformity, they are trifling in comparison of those attached to the profession of the Catholic Priest. Lord Mansfield upon the Bench declared, that, by the law of the realm, IT WAS TREASON FOR A PRIEST TO BREATHE WITHIN THE LAND.

After a display of intolerance so unequivocal and undisguised, we can hardly wonder that, by the 62d canon, “the churchwardens, or questmen, or assistants, if they *do, or shall* know any man within the parish, *or elsewhere*, that is.....a defender of Popish or erroneous doctrines,” are ordered, “to detect and represent the same to the bishop of the diocese, or ordinary of the place, *to be censured and PUNISHED*.”†

One instance more, and we have done with the Church of England. The reader will be sorry to find the distinguished name of Usher foremost in the disgraceful proceeding.—“The Bishops assembled in the house of the Primate,” says Leland, “to bear their testimony against the ungodly concessions to Popery meditated by the state. In the fervour of their zeal, these prelates *unanimously* subscribed a protestation, entitled,

---

\* See the penalties, as detailed by Blackstone, book iii, ch. vii, § 1.

† See the “Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, treated upon by the Archbishops and Bishops, and the rest of the Clergy of Ireland, and agreed upon in their synod, holden at Dublin, A.D. 1634.”

“The judgment of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, concerning *toleration of religion*.” In this they say:—

“The religion of the Papists is superstitious and idolatrous; their faith and doctrine erroneous and heretical; their church, in respect of both, apostatical. TO GIVE THEM, THEREFORE, A TOLERATION, OR TO CONSENT THAT THEY MAY FREELY EXERCISE THEIR RELIGION, AND PROFESSE THEIR FAITH AND DOCTRINE, IS A GRIEVOUS SINNE.....It is to make ourselves accessory to their superstitions, idolatrics, heresies, and, in one word, all the abominations of Popery. . . . And, as it is a great sinne, so also a matter of most dangerous consequence. The consideration thereof we commend to the wise and judicious, beseeching the zealous God of truth, to make THEM WHO ARE IN AUTHORITY, zealous of God's glory, and the advancement of true religion, zealous, resolute, and courageous, against all Popery, superstition, and idolatry.” Signed, November 26th, 1626, by the Archbishops of Armagh and Cashel, and nine Bishops, representing in all seventeen sees.”

This is a document which sets all commentary at defiance. We shall merely mention, that the “*UNGODLY CONCESSION to the Papists meditated by the State*,” was, simply, the adoption of their humble offer, to support, for the service of the State, five thousand foot and five hundred horse, on condition of their being allowed *to exercise their religion without molestation* !!

The Presbyterian Churches are no less liable to these charges. The ever-memorable “*League and Covenant—agreed upon*,” as the title states, “by the Parliamentary Commissioners and Divines, both of the Churches of England and Scotland, approved by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and by both Houses of Parliament and Assembly of Divines in England, 1643,” and on several subsequent occasions,—contains a distinct pledge, to which *all subscribed*, and “*with their right hand lifted up to the Most High God*, did SWEAR, that they should, without respect of persons, endeavour the EXTIRPATION of *POPERY, Prelacy, superstition, heresy, schism*, profaneness, and whatsoever should be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness.”\* Accordingly, in 1648, an act was passed, ordaining, that “all persons maintaining or defending, by writing or otherwise, certain heresies herein enumerated, shall, upon complaint, or proof, by the oaths of two witnesses before two justices of the peace, or confession of the party, be committed to prison, without bail or mainprize, until the next gaol delivery; and if the indictment be found, and the party refuse to abjure his said error, and his defence and maintenance of the same, he shall suffer the pains of death, as in felony, with-

\* Covenant, sect. 2.



out benefit of clergy; and if he recant or abjure, he shall remain in prison until he find sureties, that he will not maintain the same errors or heresies any more; but if he relapse, and is arrested a second time, he shall suffer death, as before.”†

In “the Larger Catechism agreed upon by the assembly of divines at Westminster,” among the SINS FORBIDDEN BY THE SECOND COMMANDMENT, is enumerated, “the TOLERATION of a false religion;”—and in the well-known confession of Westminster, which received the same solemn sanction, the same persecuting doctrines are laid down with still greater precision. In the twentieth chapter, which, rather singularly, is headed,—“On Christian *Liberty* and *Liberty of Conscience*,” (sect. 4th) it is ordained, “that, for the publishing of *such opinions*, or maintaining such practices, as are contrary to the light of nature, or the pure principles of Christianity, whether concerning FAITH, WORSHIP, or conversation, and to the power of Godliness, they may be lawfully brought to account, and proceeded against by THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE, and the censures of the Church.”

Chapter 23, sect. 3—“*The civil Magistrate* may not assert to himself the administration of the Word and Sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; yet he *hath authority*, and it is HIS DUTY, to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church; and that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and *heresies be suppressed*, all corruptions and abuses in *worship and discipline* prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed.”‡

Such are a few passages, selected, we must say, without much research, from the authentic instruments of the two National Established Churches,—taken, as the reader is aware, not from the pages of an obscure writer, possessing no weight beyond that which his arguments carry with them, nor from the notes of an unapproved and almost unknown Bible, but from documents, which the English and Scottish Clergy are obliged at their ordination to profess, and whose authority is the authority of the Church which they represent.§ In parting from this sub-

† Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iii. Anno 1648.

‡ The words themselves will appear sufficiently explicit, but the passages of Scripture adduced in confirmation, would warrant the most furious extreme of persecution. See “Confession, &c. with the Scripture Proofs at large.” *Edinburgh*, 1781. We have before us copious extracts, of the most unequivocal character, from “A Compendium of the Laws of the Church of Scotland;” but we can only refer the reader, who is curious in “specimens” of intolerance, to its pages *passim*, but specially p. 188, *et seq.*

§ The contrast here pointed at has not been fully appreciated. I. The works whose intolerance is imputed to Catholics, are the productions of private individuals, without weight or authority—those from which we quote are the *authoritative instruments*

ject, we would exhort the modern apostles of intolerance to pause, for a while, in their crusade of fanaticism, and study these "*dicta priorum*," to them invaluable for their present purposes. But their lives and conduct have already manifested so thorough an acquaintance with their spirit, that we feel the charge would be worse than superfluous.\*

We have devoted so much space to this very comprehensive topic, that we must confine ourselves to a mere transcript of the account of the remaining classes:—

---

*of the Churches to which they belong.* II. No Catholic subscribes, or in any way acknowledges, the authority in the first case,—in the second, *every clergyman is obliged to make a solemn and unequivocal declaration.* III. The former are in the Latin language, and only in the hands of educated men, capable of forming a judgment with regard to the arguments,—the latter are in *plain English, and in the hands of all, old and young—educated and uneducated.* IV. The former have received no sanction,—or, (granting the full demand of those who are most violent) at least, *these principles have been a thousand times disclaimed,—the latter possess all the public authority which the most solemn sanction, in the first instance, and the solemn and continued declarations of individual clergymen ever since, can communicate.*

The last few weeks have brought to light a new bugbear, destined to put fear and detestation of Popery into the hearts of the Protestants of Britain, and money into the pockets of the knaves who practise on their credulity. Long since, the public was assured, that Dens' was a class-book at Maynooth. This did not tell—the very authors of the falsehood have abandoned it in despair. A new ground has been taken. Bellarmine is now the text-book—a very convenient one, no doubt, and well adapted (being in four or five folio volumes) to be carried about in the pocket as a book of reference. But what is the ground? A letter of the President, in which he mentions, that the students "do not confine themselves to the treatises, (Bailly and Delahogue) but, in the library, read the *works referred to*, Tournelly, Bossuet, Bellarmine, &c." Truly this is a most satisfactory proof! On this principle, a long list of *Protestant text-books of Maynooth* might be made out. Many of the distinguished Protestant divines are "*referred to in the treatises*," (as Bull, Abbadie, T. 3, p. 11, 19, 77, &c.) and Dr. Slevin (p. 185) states, "that the students are encouraged to read Protestant controversialists along with the refutations." We shall soon, therefore, hear, that the works of Tillotson, Jeremy Taylor, and Bramhall, *are text-books of Maynooth*, and the Catholics of Ireland will be held responsible for the intolerance of the homilies and canons of the Church of England, the "Covenant," and "Confession of Westminster," or the persecuting doctrines (of a far deeper dye than those of Dens or Bellarmine, for they are written in the blood of Servetus) of Calvin and Beza. The students read in Bellarmine the subjects "to which they are referred." We defy the entire hypocritical and fanatical phalanx to point out a *single reference to any one of these passages.*

Let Mr. McGhee look to his own principles. Let him denounce the books of homilies, of common prayer, and the acts of convocation. Let him commence a crusade against the Covenant, and the Confession of Westminster. Let him denounce the memory of those who compiled, and the *living intolerance of those who subscribe, them.* Let him emancipate—not himself, for *his chains are of gold*, too precious to be flung aside—but his deluded hearers. Let him "*lead*" HIS OWN VICTIMS into the light, and life, and liberty of the Gospel. *If he do this*, we shall perhaps believe that he is a sincere hater of intolerance.

\* His Lordship of Exeter will be able to furnish those, who are anxious to pursue the study, with the newest\* and most approved editions of all the old apologists of intolerance; as also a most important principle,—the credit of originating which is due to his Lordship himself,—that *men are accountable, and may be punished*, not only for their own opinions, but also for *those of their wives or families.*—See the account of the late proceedings at St. Ives.

“ The divinity class receives two lectures weekly, of an hour each, from the Professor of Sacred Scripture. A chapter of the New Testament (or more than one if necessary) is marked out, and the students are obliged to be prepared to analyze and explain it. The class-book, used for this purpose, is the Commentary of Menochius, 3 vols. 4to.,† which the students are obliged to procure at their own expense. On one day in the week, the Professor employs an extra half hour in hearing the students comment on the Gospels, or Epistles appointed for the following Sunday; and the senior members of the class, in succession, are called upon to preach a sermon on Sundays and holidays. The students are also farther exercised, by means of public disputation, once in a month. A chapter in the Bible is selected, and they are called upon to argue on it, one against another. At the end of the year, a public examination is held, when, during three days, *all* are examined, to ascertain the proficiency which they have made. There is also a Hebrew class, formed out of the divinity students, and instruction given to them on one day in the week. All are at liberty to attend; but only a few find time, from their other studies, for the acquisition of a knowledge of Hebrew.‡ Many of the students from Connaught and Munster, and some from the other provinces, attend the Professor of Irish from five till six o'clock in the evening, during the second year of their course.”—pp. 45-6.

The highest class is that of the Dunboyne students, regularly twenty in number, who—

“ After completing the usual course, and exhibiting more than ordinary talent, remain for three years additional, in order to qualify themselves better for the duties of parish priests, and masters of conference, or to be professors in the College. The Dunboyne students receive £30 a-year each, besides their commons. They are allowed more liberty than the other students; are distinguished by a particular dress, and dine at a separate table. They are under the instruction of a professor, who is called the Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment. They attend four lectures in the week, two in Divinity, one in Church History, or Canon Law, and one in Hebrew.”

We must content ourselves with a very brief notice of the third part of the pamphlet, which, although the longest—extending to forty 8vo. pages—is, beyond comparison, the weakest of the whole.

† No student, however, confines his reading to this Commentator. All have recourse, in difficult passages, to the more comprehensive works of A'Lapide, Estius, Maldonatus, Jansenius, or Calmet. They receive lectures also on the general questions connected with the study of the Scripture, its inspiration, canon, language, various senses, versions, &c. In all they are interrogated at the general examination.

‡ The number, we believe, varies from twenty-five to about forty. We learn from a clergyman, who was a member of the class a few years since, that, during his second year, the students read the prophecies of Zacharias and Malachi, the Lamentations of Jeremias, about thirty Psalms, and those portions of Daniel which are written in Chaldee. They also received instructions in the grammars of the Syriac and Chaldee languages.

Assuming as a fact, that a "great change has taken place in the political character of the priests within the last forty years," the writer proceeds to shew, by "the testimony of their own leaders and friends," that this change is to be attributed to the influence of Maynooth education. Accordingly, after advancing a few authorities, among whom (the *leaders* and *friends* of the Catholics) a renegade Irish Catholic, and an illiberal Scotch tourist, hold a very conspicuous place, he arrives, by generalizing facts, and repeating some of the statements already refuted, at the sweeping and logical conclusion, that, "whatever it may be thought best to do with that seminary in future, it is plainly the duty of Parliament to suspend its usual grant"! He advances no argument from the constitution of the College: but he takes care to suppress the reasons *to the contrary*, derived from the restrictions of Collegiate discipline. It is impossible that the political character of the clergy should be affected by their education at Maynooth, unless, perhaps, on the principle of reaction. "There is a law prohibiting the introduction of newspapers,"—"the severest penalties are annexed to the reading or introduction of them."\* The same law regards all periodicals of a political tendency. No political discussions are permitted, no manifestation of political feeling is sanctioned among the students; and, in every movement of a political character, the College, as a public body, has been apathetic in the extreme. And yet this ingenious writer traces all "to the influence of Maynooth education"!

Every one knows, who knows any thing of Ireland, that it is vain to look here for the causes of the change—if change it can be called—of which this writer, and his croaking confederates complain so loudly. The man who confines himself to his study, and searches for it among the pamphlets of Tory parsons, or the diaries of bigoted tourists, will infallibly be disappointed in his search. Let him go abroad among the people, and view the face of the country. Let him, if his feelings are equal to the task, contemplate its manifold misery. Let him turn from the deserted and decaying village, to the mouldering ruins of the once comfortable farm-house, and enquire the little story of her misery from the squalid and mendicant mother, as she seeks, by some temporary expedient, to still the querulous hunger of her famishing orphans. He will hear every where—for, alas! there is no lack of opportunity for enquiry—some tale of local tyranny, some sacrifice of honest industry, referable only to the conscientious exercise of constitutional right, to the non-residence of the absentee landlord, or to the still more wasting presence of the grinding agent, or the heartless tithe owner. He will find, that "the

---

\* Appen. p. 116.

causes lie much deeper than religious dissension;" that "they involve the subsistence of the people;" and that "the want of sympathy between the higher and lower classes; the unequal administration of law; the Vestry acts; the trading spirit of landlords; redundant tenantry, and the consequent frightful competition for land; the intolerable rents; the modes of letting; non-residence, and middle-men,—are some of the evils which afflict Ireland."\* And when he has found, by personal examination, that this state of things is not bounded by the limits of parishes, or counties, or provinces, let him reflect whether it is wonderful that men, who have minds to estimate, and hearts to feel, this misery, with which they are in necessary and habitual contact, should have been forced into a participation of the effort which sought its alleviation. We conceive it impossible that it should be otherwise. And if, in some isolated instances, imprudent zeal, under the influence of strong temporary excitement, may have outstepped the limits of strict ecclesiastical decorum, it must be acknowledged, on the other hand, that the interference of the clergy has invariably exerted a salutary influence on the undisciplined minds of the people, procuring the silent and harmless evaporation of wild passions, wrought up to a pitch of almost pardonable frenzy, which must otherwise, by their rude explosion, have convulsed the surface of society, or, by their slow and unseen working, undermined its very foundations. Familiar with all the peculiarities of this people, knowing all the avenues through which their hearts may be reached, and all the motives by which their judgment may be satisfied, their passions hushed into silence, their feelings excited to hope, and their pride subdued in apprehension,—in a word, acquainted with all the nameless, but exhaustless machinery, by which the energies of a people so sensitive may be directed to good, and turned away from evil,—the Catholic clergy possess over them a control, which is the result at once of reverence and love, and which no other possible combination of characters could produce. "It is true," says a Protestant writer, whose language declares him no blind apologist, "that much inconvenience is experienced from the political character of the priests; but let the most thoughtless person reflect, for a moment, on the consequences which must result from any considerable diminution of their authority . . . . *they are the best check which exists to moderate the wild career of ignorance and passion.*"†

\* Bicheno's Ireland, p. 197.

† Ibid, 195. "I have always felt myself, that, if the influence which the Catholic priests have over the peasantry were removed, a very useful check would be lost." (Colonel W. Curry's Evidence, 3d Report on State of Ireland, p. 299.) The last month has added another to the countless examples of this truth.

We have already far exceeded the limits originally proposed for this article. But so much time has been given to the comfortless duty of answering objections, and refuting charges, that we cannot deny ourselves the liberty of saying a few words "proprio motu," and upon our own authority.

These pages have been written with the well-known letter of Edmund Burke\* before us, and we know no more satisfactory apologist of the studies and discipline of Maynooth. Opinion, with regard to its usefulness, will, of course, vary with political or religious feeling, but there are some observations which will strike every mind, no matter what the colour of its creed or politics. The general system of instruction seems admirably calculated to secure proficiency. Not content with mere mechanical attendance at the lectures, or the precarious plan of voluntary preparation for the periodical examinations, it provides that each student shall be liable to examination, at the daily lectures, the matter of which the Professor has previously explained. Not satisfied with testing the proficiency of the students of Theology by a shallow catechetical examination, in Scripture or Divinity, or a superficial acquaintance with "Paley's Evidences," or a certificate of mere attendance, during a single term of twenty or thirty lectures, the statutes arrange that the Theological and Scriptural studies, which proceed "*pari passu*," shall continue under the plan of instruction and examination already explained, during three successive years, the last of the course. The arguments of Catholic doctrine are detailed, the objections fully and fairly discussed. Each student is not only at liberty, but is even encouraged, to propose any difficulty which may occur to his mind; it is a point of duty with the Professor to explain it to his perfect satisfaction†. It has been a favourite charge, that, in examining controverted questions, the students are confined to what is called the "Distorted View" of their own treatise, kept in utter ignorance of the arguments of the adversary, and shut out from all means of ascertaining the real grounds of the dispute. Nothing can be more unfounded. The Librarian, Dr. Slevin, (p. 185), states that "they have a large collection of Protestant authors, on all religious subjects, and on controversy in particular; that the students have free access to them; that they are never prohibited from reading them, but, on the contrary, are *encouraged to read them along with the refutations*." But, in truth, it is impossible not to be struck by the contrast between Catholic and Protestant polemical works,

---

\* Vol. 6, pp. 280, *et seq.* We can only refer to it. He seems to have anticipated most of the objections which are now made to the system.

† Append. p. 186.—Dr. Slevin's Examination.

in this particular. In the former, the larger portion of the treatise is *invariably* devoted to the objections of adversaries; in the latter, these objections are either suppressed altogether, or, more commonly, unfairly represented.

It appears from a comparison of the number of students, who leave the College at the expiration of each year, with the annual deficit of clergy throughout the kingdom, that the College is not by any means adequate to supply the exigencies of the mission. Hence, there has always been an anxiety to increase the number of students, and, consequently, to extend the accommodations which the building affords. With the single exception of the Duke of Bedford's administration, no encouragement has been held out to enable the trustees to carry into effect this very just and reasonable design. The surplus funds, which "the occasional cheapness of provisions," or unceasing economy in the management of the Collegiate revenues, placed in the hands of the Bursar, supplied the only means for its accomplishment. The consequence is obvious. From a well-meant, and perhaps necessary, but certainly unfortunate, economy, many things have found their way into the system, injurious to the real interest, not less than to the respectability, of the Establishment. Instead of improving, or perfecting what had been already done, the sole object seems to have been to enlarge and extend the building. Thus, the general appearance of the house, although free, perhaps, from any substantial defect, is tasteless and inelegant; while the library, though very well provided in ecclesiastical works, is not as well supplied with modern books of literature and science, as might be desired in such an Institution. Thus the students are, to a great extent, debarred from the means of consulting the modern works, in the several departments of their study; and a tax is imposed upon the Professors, to meet which their paltry salaries are altogether inadequate. Under any circumstances, indeed, they are quite out of proportion with the importance and responsibility of the offices which they hold.\*

---

\* The following are the salaries of the Superiors and Professors of Maynooth College;—

President,	-	-	£326
Vice-President,	-	-	150
Prefect of Dunboyne Establishment and Librarian,	-	-	140
Senior Dean, Bursar, Professors of Theology, Professor of			
Scripture, each	-	-	122
Junior Dean and remaining Professors, each	-	-	112

Thus the revenue of one Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, is *nineteen or twenty times as great* as that of the Divinity Professors at Maynooth, and *exceeds* in amount the *united salaries* of all the Professors, of Divinity, Philosophy, and Languages!

There is another, however, and a more substantial evil, which, though it cannot be charged upon the institution, yet tends, more than all the rest, to paralyze its energies; we mean the imperfect system of education, in reference to general subjects, *pursued in the public schools in many parts of Ireland.* This is a defect, which the professional education may remedy, but cannot absolutely remove, and which must be a great obstacle to the full developement of the system. The leading feature of the plan of national education, proposed by the Catholics, on the passing of the relief-bill in 1793, was, the establishment of a grammar school in each diocese, for the purposes of preparatory education. The plan was suspended by the Government measure for the foundation of a Catholic College: but, although part of the provisions were realized in the establishment of one general Seminary, the equally, if not more, important care of early education was still left to the precarious resources of an impoverished people. The motive of the Government measure, even at the time, was a matter of dispute. While some were content to acknowledge with gratitude the bounty, which, poor as it was, was scarcely expected; others, and, in fact, the greater number, regarded it, as the cold concession of policy, rather than the free gift of benevolence; and certainly, long experience has since proved, that it was neither sufficiently extended in its application, nor sufficiently comprehensive in its plan, to meet the object for which it was professedly intended. To develope fully all its advantages, by preparing *all* the students to profit *equally* by the extensive course of Philosophy and Divinity, which it comprises, the plan should have embraced, as did that which it superseded, the establishment of Diocesan Schools, wherein all the necessary preparatory studies might have been gone through. Sensible, indeed, of this fact, and seeking, as far as their limited resources would permit, to supply the deficiency, many of the Catholic Bishops have established elementary schools in their dioceses. But, without looking to the injustice of leaving to the unaided exertions of private individuals, already sufficiently burdened, a matter of such difficulty as the early instruction of so large a community, it is obvious, that, in the present struggling and impoverished condition of Ireland, Catholic education, upon such a footing, must necessarily be precarious. We cannot leave the subject, therefore, without saying, that it is a matter which demands immediate and decided interference. It is an injustice to which the eyes of the people are already opened; and which is thrown out into stronger and more striking relief, by the exposure, becoming every day more public, of the enormous revenues devoted to the support of Protestantism. We cannot believe, that an enlightened public



will longer sanction the anomalous state of things, in which, as we have shown, SEVEN MILLIONS OF THE IRISH PEOPLE RECEIVE FOR THE EDUCATION OF THEIR CLERGY, AND THE SUPPORT OF THEIR RELIGION, JUST THE ONE-HUNDRED-AND-EIGHTH PART OF THE SUM APPROPRIATED TO THE RELIGIOUS USES OF THE REMAINING MILLION.

In the details which we have given, the reader will find, we are sure, sufficient grounds to justify him in "reconsidering the case of Maynooth College," and forming, we doubt not, a decision, very different from that to which the insidious writer before us would lead him. If the Institution were still untried, if it were unable to refer to facts, in confirmation of the principles on which its defence is grounded, the enemies of religion might hope to crush it, by filling the public mind with prejudice, and withdrawing all opportunity for the display of its real character. But "the trial of forty years" gives the lie to their impotent calumnies; and experience, the surest test of merit, has established, in the hearts and affections of the people, a character which is beyond their power. A Hierarchy, above the reach of slander, a learned, zealous and devoted Clergy, who, in joy and in sorrow, in good and evil repute, have stood by the side of their people, ministering to their wants, and solacing their miseries, while they preserved their faith from corruption, and "guided their souls unto justice"—these are living monuments of the public services of Maynooth College—undeniable testimonies to its capacity for good. These are its surest foundations—the well-tried virtue of the Clergy it has produced, the enduring and affectionate reverence of the people to whom their lives are devoted. He, who would assail its good name with any prospect of ultimate success, must turn his thoughts to an indispensable preliminary step—he must annihilate the one, or revolutionize the other.

ART. VII.—*Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts in Deutschland. Materials for the Ecclesiastical History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century.* 8vo. Augsburg. 1835.

IT is high time to call the attention of the world to the system of slow and silent persecution which has been long wasting the strength, and exhausting the patience, of our continental brethren, the subjects of Protestant princes. It is a solemn duty of those, who have the means, to expose to the just indig-

nation of our country the artful and heartless plan, which prevails in several states, and particularly in Prussia, of making the most sacred rights of Catholics, whether based upon natural or constitutional law, matter either of police regulation, or of annoying domiciliary legislation; and this for the avowed purpose of undermining their religion. We have used two epithets confessedly severe, but we retract, nay we modify, them not. That this system of persecution is *heartless*, that it is unfeeling to the last degree, will be readily acknowledged by all, who are aware of its form and character. For if the constant, the unwearied, the unrelaxing enmity of a legal adversary, who pursues his victim in malice through one tribunal after another, deserve that appellation; if the untiring spy who tracks an unwary being by day and by night, at home and abroad, to entangle him within the meshes of the law, unmoved by pity, unchecked by resistance—if such a one can be called heartless in his conduct, then have we not adopted too strong an epithet to characterize the system which we are about to describe. And as to its being most *artful*, it is so to such an extent as to deceive, if possible, “even the elect.” Von Raumer himself, with all his sagacity and information, appears to believe that the utmost impartiality is observed by the Prussian government in its dealings with Catholics. Nay, he repeats one of his own replies to a person that condemned the conduct of Prussia towards her Catholic subjects; and assures us that it was distinguished only “by justice, charity, confidence, and a scrupulous equality in the treatment of them and of the Protestants.”\*

The reader will shortly see some amiable specimens of this impartiality, charity and justice. If, however, the professor of history in Berlin could be thus deceived, what wonder, that in England, Prussia should have been often pointed out, in our periodical works, as a fair model for imitation in the practical application of tolerant principles? And yet, God forbid that it should ever be adopted, even in poor Ireland! Better the tithe-proctor than the spy; more tolerable the open assaults of an adverse religion, than the smothering protection of a hostile government.

If hitherto the covert and scattered workings of the system have enabled it to escape the notice of the public, the little work before us has left it no chance of lying any longer concealed. We need not say that every thing was done to prevent its obtaining circulation; even though printed in the Bavarian territory, the influence of the Prussian cabinet was employed to procure

---

\* England in 1835, Vol. I. p. 14, Austin's Trans.

an order from Munich for its suppression. The order came, and was executed; but the book had already flown across the length and breadth of Germany, it had already awakened the sympathies and the indignation of the people; and *five* copies, if we are rightly informed, were all that remained to be seized. It is our intention to lay before our readers the substance of this work, which is a collection of materials for future history, rather than a continued narrative.\* We shall not, however, follow the order observed by the author, nor even refer to his page for all that we shall draw from him. They, who wish to see the painful topic treated in all its harassing details, must peruse the work itself; they, who are anxious to know how deeply and how practically the grievances, which it exposes, are felt through the country, must converse with those whom they affect. We will gladly abide by the result of either investigation.

The Catholic subjects of Prussia are nearly, if not quite, equal in number to those who profess the Protestant religion. In 1827, the Protestants of all communions amounted to 6,370,380, while the Catholics were reckoned at 4,023,513, or considerably more than the members of either the Lutheran or Reformed Church. Hassel had, however, previously estimated the Protestants at 5,187,900, and the Catholics at, 4,352,000, thus bringing them much nearer to an equality with the united force of the other two religions.

It is important to remind our readers, in this place, that the Catholic worship is as fully tolerated and recognized by law as either of the others, and that the professor of one faith stands before the eye of his country on a perfect equality with the professor of another. Again, in some provinces, as in the Rhenish district, the population is essentially and entirely Catholic, as much so, at least, as in Brandenburg or Western Prussia it is Protestant; that is to say, in the former the Protestants, in the latter the Catholics, are the exception. Impartiality of treatment, therefore, may easily be tested. Whatever religious rights the Protestants of the eastern provinces may possess, the Catholics of the western ought surely to enjoy; whatever consideration is had of the spiritual concerns of the small congregations, or few isolated Protestants, who happen to live scattered amidst the Catholic population, should not certainly be refused to the no less numerous Catholics, who are mingled with the great body of Protestants in the original dominions of Prussia. Now then, let us see how the case stands.

Whenever a *small* congregation of Protestants is formed, a Church, or public hall, a clergyman and a school are immediately granted for the benefit of their religion; whenever a *large* con-

gregation of Catholics collects, and applies, as is required, for permission to have a place of worship, the application is sure to be rejected. For examples of the first assertion, we need only cite the cases of Habelschwerd, Landek, Lublinitz, Möllna, and Ottmachan, the number of Protestant inhabitants in which varies only from 32 to 78; yet they have obtained, without difficulty, parish churches with resident, or chapels with occasional, pastors.

For a proof of the second, let us take the case of Görlitz. Here was a congregation of 600 Catholics, besides the garrison, and 150 culprits condemned to the public works. They had no place of worship nearer than Janernick, distant two German, or eight English, miles. Again and again, they applied for permission to provide themselves with a chapel, but to no purpose. In 1826, they presented a memorial directly to the King, a memorial at once manly and pathetic, entreating him to take their case into consideration. They spoke of their situation, they enumerated their previous but fruitless applications. It had been originally their intention, they said, to apply for the use of one of the seven evangelical churches, of which six were originally Catholic, and four were now hardly ever used: but the Protestants would not agree, and they now, therefore, simply entreated to be allowed to buy a private house, (*ein Privatlokal*) and to erect a church, with a school and dwelling for their pastor. Look, they exclaimed, to the condition of the old, the weak, and the sickly; look to the hardship experienced even by the young and the strong, in the heats of summer and the inclemency of winter, journeying over a distance of eight miles to a place of worship. Nor were their children, 100 in number, less the objects of pity. Without instructors, and the means of instruction, they entreated permission to erect places of prayer and education, where their youth might be taught the duty of good subjects, and instructed to pray for his Majesty's welfare. The answer to this moving petition, directed to the two deputies who had signed the memorial, on behalf of their fellow-religionists, deserves to be recorded. It is as follows:—

“The undersigned ministry informs the Currier Kögler and the Builder Röhnisch, with regard to their direct application of 20th ult., that the King's Majesty is not pleased to grant their request for the erection of a church and parochial system.

(Signed)

“MINISTRY FOR SPIRITUAL, EDUCATIONAL, AND MEDICAL AFFAIRS.”  
Berlin, 26th Nov. 1826.

This decision of the church, school, and medical department, requires no comment. Yet it is right to give the conclusion of

this affair. Three years later, and after eight years of unceasing application, its prayer was granted; that is, leave was given to have the Catholic worship performed *nine times a year for the old and weak*, on condition, however, that it should not be in any place specially destined for the purpose, but *in a private house, to be hired for the occasion* ! The local authorities were enjoined to watch most strictly over the fulfilment of this condition, and a threat was added, that otherwise the severest penalties would ensue. There, there is toleration for you ! Without a royal leave, *toties quoties* to be obtained, after eight years of bitter refusals, mass cannot even be said in a private house ! The Catholics of Great Britain were not worse off a hundred years ago, than their brethren of Prussia are now.

But this is not a solitary case. In Mullhausen, in 1813, the French, without interfering with the funds, had made over to the Catholics, who were 500 in number, at the last census, the Church of St. James, which had only been used once, or at most twice, by the Protestants. At the peace, the Prussian government annulled this arrangement, though the Catholics were thus left without any place of worship nearer than two German miles, and though two churches had been taken from the Catholics in that district, and given to the Protestants. These, we need not add, were not restored. Report said, when our author wrote, that, after all, the Church of St. James was to be yielded to the Catholics. "Should this be verified," he adds, "we will gladly, for the astonishment of the world, append the joyful intelligence to the errata, as a rare phenomenon in Prussia."

Another example, from the left bank of the Rhine, a country entirely Catholic. In 1818, the Protestants of Treves solicited the joint use of one of the Catholic Churches,—the *Simultaneum*, as it is called in Germany,—and the magistrates proposed two parish churches for the purpose. However, after some deliberation, the *Simultaneum* of the seminary Church was granted, until, as the ministerial decree expressed it, they should be provided with a place of worship exclusively their own. Now, government had already in its hands the beautiful, but suppressed Church of St. Martin, which it was intended to give them. But this would have been no triumph over the Catholic population; so that first, this church was turned into an almost uninhabitable barrack, and then the seminary Church was declared public property, and by a cabinet order, dated 25th February, 1819, made over entirely to the Protestants ! The basis of the grant was perfectly false; for the right of the seminary and gymnasium to the church was fully recognised by law. Every remonstrance, however, proved unavailing; and the Catholics were left to the necessity of begging

subscriptions, either for the erection of a church, or for the repurchase from the Protestants of the one whereof they had been despoiled.

We must leave this portion of our task more than half unfinished. Suffice it to say, that never yet has a Protestant Church been ceded to the Catholics, while every where Catholic ones have been seized for the Protestants. In Gallanz, a fine well-built church belonging to the Catholics was given to their rivals, and the Catholics were left to perform their devotions in an old and ruinous building. In Warburg, the beautiful Dominican Church was given to the Protestants, and the Catholics, whose forefathers had built it, were left to build another; for the one granted to them in exchange was already threatening to fall, and has since carried its threats into effect. But we pass over these things, as we do also the unequal treatment of the two religions in point of provision for the clergy; and hasten to another part of our subject.

In countries where the two religions are equally tolerated, it is usual to have separate universities, in which the theological faculty is exclusively for the members of its own creed. Thus it is in Bavaria, where there are two, one Protestant, and the other Catholic. In Prussia, we might naturally expect the same arrangement; but, on the contrary, the usual partiality for one side is evidently manifested. For the 6,000,000 Protestants, there are four universities, at Berlin, Halle, Königsberg, and Greifswalde. These are strictly Protestant, not only in the theological faculty, but in every other; for the solitary Catholic professor, who resides, is allowed only as an exception. In fact, when the royal commissioner of the university, Brackedorf, embraced the Catholic faith, he was dismissed from his post; and when two eminent law-professors, Jarke and Phillips, took the same steps, they were likewise deprived of their chairs, and one of them, at least, compelled to seek an asylum in a foreign land. But for the Catholics, who are above 4,000,000, two *half universities* are sufficient. They have no such establishments to themselves; they possess only a share in the two mixed universities of Bonn and Breslau, in each of which there is a double professor of each class of theology, and a double faculty, the one Catholic, and the other Protestant. Thus the Catholic youth can never study in any place removed from controversial jars: while the Protestant is kept out of all danger of similar inconveniences, by the exclusiveness of his universities. The professors of other faculties belong to either religion, but, like the commissary royal, are most of them Protestants. While the Protestants have thus four entire universities, with the half of two others, and the Catholics

have only the sorry remnant of these two, or rather only a section of this remnant, be it remembered, that the latter bear no less than five-twelfths, or nearly one-half, of the public burthens, out of which these establishments are supported. Here again is impartiality and equal treatment; and yet this is far from the worst feature of the university system.

The Catholic ecclesiastical authorities have no voice in the nomination of the theological professors. The Bishop is simply asked whether he has any thing to object, *on proof*, against the candidate before nomination. This candidate may be an utter stranger, of whom the bishop knows nothing; he may be free from open immorality, or heretical doctrine; he may be out of the reach of demonstrable accusation; and as the bishop, therefore, can *prove* nothing to his disadvantage, he is forthwith installed, and placed beyond the limits of Catholic jurisdiction. Lamentable instances of the working of this system could be quoted. A foreign professor was named to Breslau; he began to teach the most scandalous doctrines,—that the scripture was not inspired, that its narratives were fabulous, &c. Complaints were made to the bishop, and by the bishop, but in vain. It was not till after many years—it was not till after the poison had widely circulated among his pupils, that he was at length removed. With the excellent Jarke and Phillips proceedings were not so dilatory.

In like manner, the impious and worthless Dereser, after having been instrumental, during the last century, in corrupting the faith and morals of the German youth, in the university of Bonn,\* after having been expelled from Switzerland by the young men whom he had striven to seduce, and who pursued him from Lucerne with the design of corporally chastising him—after having been driven by his scholars from the seminary of Rottenburg, and having seen his works on scripture condemned at Rome, as containing all the principles of modern infidelity—even he was, in 1811, unblushingly nominated Catholic professor of biblical hermeneutics at Breslau, in spite of the earnest remonstrances of the Prince-bishop.

But the Universities are not the worst part of Prussian arrangements for Catholic education. In the gymnasias, or schools of a higher order, will easily be discovered symptoms of the same insidious policy, and the same unfair partiality. In Silesia, as Theines informs us, the colleges of the Jesuits were converted into such establishments, and, for a time, directed by their old superiors.

---

\* We speak of the Bonn of 1786, when first opened by the Elector of Cologne, as a university for the doctrine of the impious *Illuminati*. At present, with such men for professors as Klec, Windischmann, Walther, &c., it will compete with any other in Europe for solid learning, and sound principles.

Gradually, however, these and all other ecclesiastics have been removed; young lay professors have been installed; and the bishop may reckon himself happy that one clergyman is allowed to remain, and, under a strict injunction of avoiding all fanaticism in matters of religion, and of saying nothing that can shock his *Protestant* hearers, is permitted to give religious instruction once, or at most twice, in the week. In fact, the bishop has no influence over the education of his future clergy, save what a residence of a few months in a seminary can give, after years of contact with the corrupted, demoralized, or, at least, unecclesiastical elements which compose too many universities.

These gymnasia or colleges were many of them Catholic endowments. But, in Prussia, there is little stir about "appropriation clauses," when the spoil is Popish. Short work is made with it—it is all considered the property of the state. As with the Churches, however, so with other sacred possessions, the reciprocity, to use an Irish phrase, is all on one side. It is the old question of *whose bull has gored*; "the case is altered," when the property is that of the man-in-power. In Cologne, the Carmelite College has been made over to the Protestants, that of Erfurt has been declared a *mixed* establishment, that is to say, every individual professor is Protestant, except one clergyman, who gives religious instruction! In Düsseldorf, also, a Catholic gymnasium has been changed into a mixed one, in a spirit of such impartiality, that, when Professor Durst embraced the Catholic faith, it cost him no little labour to retain his chair. We need not say that never was a Protestant gymnasium changed into a Catholic, or even into a mixed, establishment. Foreign education is discountenanced, and discouraged in every way, and he, who ventures to receive it from the Jesuits, must first have renounced all worldly ambition. As to elementary schools, and indeed education in general, we may observe, that it is under the control of a provincial board, consisting of a Protestant president and three councillors, and, where the number of Catholics is considerable, *one* Catholic member. All the subalterns are Protestants. In the two Catholic districts of the Rhine and Westphalia, the place of Catholic councillor was, for several years, left unoccupied, till the schools were all reorganized; and in Saxony, with 100,000 Catholics, it was lately still vacant. A Protestant clergyman is generally the real administrator of all the Catholic education. Under him, even the Catholic bishop sits, in a matter of such vital importance to his religion!

Now for religious instruction. There is a *censure* for books, the head quarters of which are in Berlin, though its representatives are to be found in every province. Every person employed



in this department, it is needless to say, is a Protestant. Even the bishop's pastorals are subject to the provincial president's revision.

The Catholics complain that, while any writing passes muster, which contains abuse against them, every polemical writing of theirs, which is severe against Protestants, meets a rigid scrutiny, and stands the surest chance of being rejected. Nay, even the official paper, as well as other periodical publications, in the pay, and under the direct control, of the government, is used as a vehicle of the grossest slander against Catholics, while every foreign Catholic journal, which ventures to defend their cause, is forbidden admission into the state. It has been remarked, too, that no professor who boldly vindicates the doctrines of his creed, has any chance of promotion; and we are told, that Frendenfeld was obliged to quit Bonn, for presuming to comment on a certain awkward saying of Luther, whom it is not lawful to speak of in Prussia, but with respect. The pulpit is under the same restraint; there is liberty of declamation on the one side, and the strictest restraint on the other. . .

From matters ecclesiastical, and educational, let us descend to the state of social life, and see the equality of treatment observed in civil and military appointments. The treaty of Westphalia, in 1648, secured to the Catholics religious liberty, and the full possession of their church and school property. The treaty of Breslau, in 1740, which made Silesia subject to Prussia, expressly guaranteed the maintenance of the Catholic religion *in statu quo*. So sacred was this stipulation in the eyes of Frederick the Great, that, when the Pope abolished the Society of Jesus, he refused to allow the execution of the decree, and ordered his envoy at Rome to say: "J'ai garanti au traité de Breslau *in statu quo* la religion Catholique, et je n'ai jamais trouvé de meilleurs prêtres à leurs égard." He added playfully; "Vous ajouterez que, parceque j'appartiens à la classe des hérétiques, le saint père ne peut pas me dispenser de tenir ma parole, ni du devoir d'un honnête homme, et d'un roi." But the Jesuits, faithful to their vows and principles, earnestly represented to the king that a command of the Sovereign Pontiff must be obeyed; and the monarch, amazed at such an instance of resolute fidelity, sanctioned, at their express request, the act of their suppression. On another occasion, when urged by his infidel allies in France, to imitate the imperial example of Joseph II, by seizing church property, he replied, in a letter to D'Alembert,—"In my dominions no body is disturbed; the rights of property, on which civil society is based, I hold sacred." Such was the regard of the *philosophe* monarch for the rights of his Catholic subjects. Since his time,

further guarantees have been given. In 1802, it was agreed that the secularized lands should enjoy their full rights over church property, and school property, churches and schools: at the Congress of Vienna, it was settled that the Catholics and Protestants should be on a footing of perfect equality; and by the Concordat of 16th July, 1821, it was generally arranged that many other points, necessary for the welfare of the Church, should be secured.

Such are the grounds of Catholic freedom; what we have already said will show how far such provisions, as affect Church property and schools, have been observed. Let us proceed to enquire how the social equality of the two religions has been displayed. At court, there is not a single Catholic who holds a place. The government is conducted by several ministerial departments; the heads of all are Protestant. Each department has a number of councillors, who form boards, having each a chief; every chief, with one *nominal* exception, is a Protestant. Of the host of councillors at Berlin, only three are Catholics. Among the clerks and other subalterns, no Catholic. There is a state-council for important affairs, the members of which are scattered through the provinces; every member is a Protestant. If there be any Catholic, it is quite an exception. The Post-Office department, throughout the states, down to local post-masters, is exclusively Protestant. All ambassadors, consuls, &c. are, of course, Protestant, though sent to Catholic courts. We could mention a most worthy nobleman, who lost his diplomatic situation, by becoming a Catholic, and has since been appointed to a foreign embassy by Austria.

How shall we explain the minute ramifications of local government? The task is difficult, but we will do our best. The state is divided into provinces; and each province is ruled by a High President, *Ober Präsident*. Of course he is a Protestant, and yet to him are committed the religious interests of the Catholics. Each province is divided into districts, (*Bezirk*) governed by a president, always a Protestant, by a vice-president, councillors of a higher and lower class, assessors, secretaries, &c. Even in provinces entirely Catholic, every one of these, without an exception worth naming, belongs to the Protestant creed. Each district is divided into circles, which are composed of cantons as these are of communes. Each circle has a magistrate at its head, almost always a Protestant, or, if by chance a Catholic, fettered by a Protestant secretary. The inferior officers and rulers, even in Catholic provinces, are very often Protestant; but there is no instance of a Catholic holding any even of these small situations, in a Protestant district.

Judicial appointments follow the same rule. The president and vice-president of every tribunal, (of the latter there may *yet* remain a few exceptions,) and most of the assessors, and councillors, are, even in the Catholic provinces, Protestants. The inferior departments of the judicature are generously thrown open to Catholics.

Come we now to the army. Prussia is essentially a great military power, and justly boasts of a splendid war establishment. It owes its organisation to the skill and efforts of Marshal Gneisenau, a Catholic born, and educated by Jesuits! Some policy would appear to suggest to such a government, that religious bigotry should not be mixed up with army regulations, that, where the danger and the toil was equal, where the blood of him who heard mass might have to flow as gushingly as that of him who had listened to the new state liturgy, and where fidelity to the king would be best secured by giving the subject at least the means of being faithful to his God,—*there*, at any rate, equality of treatment and equality of encouragement should be found. We should not expect to read religious exclusions in the order of the day. Unfortunately, however, the reverse is the fact. It is not necessary for us to enter into any exposition of the Prussian army system, its line and landwehr. Suffice it to state, for the benefit of any reader unacquainted with it, that, throughout the Prussian dominions, every youth, with very few exceptions, must enter the regular army at twenty years of age, and be a common soldier for three years. He then passes, for two more, into the reserve, and, after that, belongs to the landwehr or militia till his thirty-second year. Having before given the relative proportions of the Catholic and Protestant population, it will be easily seen what share of the army belongs to each religion. In the two *corps d'armées* of Prussia and Silesia, one-half is Catholic; in that of Posen two-thirds, in that of Westphalia and Cleves three-fifths; finally, in the Rhenish division seven-eighths. In all, the Catholics, serving on the peace establishment of Prussia, amount to seventy or eighty thousand men. *Yet have they not one field-officer, not a general or major, and very few captains, of their religion.*

But the great hardship, of which the poor Catholics have to complain, is the way in which, being forced by law to become soldiers, the soldiers are again forced by law to neglect their religion, or, at least, to see it treated with shameful disparity. In 1832, a royal order was issued to regulate the chaplaincy of regiments. Its preamble states, that the purport of the decree is to consolidate the acts relative to this subject, subsequent to the decree of 28th March, 1811, and to provide suitably for the religious

wants of the army. Article I. states, that, during war, the number of chaplains, Evangelical and Catholic, shall be regulated by the respective wants of the two. In time of peace, the following is the number of Evangelicals. 1. A *field provost* for the entire army, who treats with the ministry concerning all that regards military ecclesiastical affairs. 2. For every *corps d'armée*, an *Oberprediger*, or superior chaplain, and for each of its two divisions a *divisions prediger*, or division preacher. 3. Garrison preachers. 4. Chaplains for military institutions, the invalid hospitals, cadet and orphan establishments. Now, after all this ample provision of military ecclesiastics, for the spiritual care of the Protestants, we might expect a similar, or at least a proportionate, solicitude for the welfare of the Catholic *five-twelfths*, in the same body. But why imagine that, though expected to fight as stoutly as their Protestant fellow-soldiers, they are entitled to enjoy an equal share of religious comfort and encouragement? Cromwell's soldiers used to say, that they would not fight unless they were allowed to preach; the poor Catholics of Germany would be extravagant to demand that they should be preached to. Not even a single Catholic chaplain is appointed, or decreed for the entire army. To be sure, if the Catholic soldier is quartered within reach of a Catholic clergyman, the latter may have access to him, but under what restrictions we shall see just now.

The fourth section decrees that all persons in active service, from superior officers down to the lowest hanger-on, their wives and children, are members of the military parish; in other words form the flock of the chaplain of the division. The article concludes with these words: "The creed of individuals has no influence on the parochial arrangements." So that a Protestant clergyman is actually made the only spiritual director of the Catholic troops—they are made his subjects, and counted, in spite of their consciences and their religious feelings, among his parishioners. And this is Prussia, in which the Catholics were aroused to arms, in 1813, by being told that they were going to fight for civil and *religious* liberty!

But the worst is still behind. The section on marriages, and baptisms of soldiers' infants, is artfully contrived. If a Catholic wishes to have either of these sacraments administered by his own clergyman, he must first have a demissorial from his Protestant military curate. This, however, is only for Catholics: no Protestant can ever obtain permission to apply for spiritual assistance in these cases to any but his military pastor: and thus, while the catholic is exposed to the temptation of accepting the ministration of a Protestant clergyman, who may refuse his leave,

or whose services are at hand, the Protestant is carefully excluded by the law from all danger to his faith by coming into contact with a Catholic ecclesiastic. There may be a thousand reasons, which a Catholic will easily understand, why a soldier, about to marry, may not like to encounter the unreserved explanations, which a Catholic priest might feel it his duty to demand. To many, therefore, a clause like this, which renders it unnecessary to approach him, must be invaluable.

The fifth section is still more intolerable. It runs as follows: "Military worship must be performed according to the liturgy prescribed for the army;" that is, a *Protestant* liturgy. "The preacher shall so arrange, on the principal festivals and Sundays, that *all* may be present, at least once a month." In other words, for three years, every Catholic is compelled by law to neglect his own worship, and, on certain occasions, to attend another, of which his conscience disapproves. Bitterly do the poor Catholic soldiers complain of this harsh and cruel law, which exists in no Catholic state. Nay, even in England, before the passing of the Relief Bill, the late Duke of York, on more than one occasion, ordered the commanding officers of regiments to make arrangements for the attendance of Catholic soldiers at their own worship. To complete this picture of equality, we will only add, that, in the garrison schools, for the education of soldiers' children, the masters are all Protestant clergymen, and that not a Catholic is allowed among them.

After seeing how every department of government patronage is exclusively in the hands of one persuasion, we have yet to see how the same spirit of one-sided legislation penetrates into the privacy of domestic life, and interposes between the natural and lawful affections of those whom God hath joined. We allude to the delicate subject of *mixed marriages*, or marriages in which the parties are a Catholic and a Protestant. Much, indeed, have we to say upon this subject, the most harrassing and distressing head of ecclesiastical legislation in Germany, for several years back. We know not whether we shall ever take up the subject more fully; but, at present we can only say, that sad has been the discord and disunion which the clashing of religious principles with human laws has produced; distressing has been the position wherein the chief pastors of the Church have been placed; and little honourable the arts by which government has striven to overcome the convictions, and stifle the feelings, of the Catholic priesthood. This view of our subject, however, we must pass over; as it is necessary to confine ourselves to a simple enunciation of the Prussian law.

The Catholic Church never approves or allows a mixed

marriage, without the previous stipulation that *all* the children shall be educated in her religion. The Prussian *landrecht* or law of the land, *formerly contained* the following provisions. (Vol. ii. Tit. 2, § 76, 77.) First, till fourteen years of age, the boys shall be brought up in the father's, and the girls in the mother's, religion. Secondly, *neither party can bind the other, even by a voluntary compact, to any other course*; and in § 81, it is added, that conversion during a last illness is not to be counted of any avail. Now if such matters as these could be justly interfered with by legislation, it might be said that the provision, here made, was equitable. Be it so: yet we would still ask, is it right to interfere between the private agreements of parties so closely and sacredly connected; and if a willing compact has been made, to sanction the violation of it, and thus open a door to bad faith and deceit? The framers of the law, however, well knew that such compacts were seldom made, except in favour of the *Catholic* education of all the children.

But we emphatically said that the law *formerly contained* this provision: for in fact it is superseded by another; and if the former was equitable, this, at least, will not be thought so. No sooner did Prussia, in 1803, obtain the great portion of its Catholic states, than a new order was issued, dated 21st November, to the following effect: "His majesty enacts, that children born in wedlock shall all be educated in the religion of the father; and that, in opposition to this provision, neither party can bind the other." Now mark the working of this law. Almost all mixed marriages take place in the Catholic provinces, where the only Protestants are the numerous civil and military *employés*, sent thither by the government. These are mostly unmarried, and we believe, purposely sent young. They form intimacies with the Catholic families among which they live, and almost necessarily marry into them. As they are well provided for, the temptation is generally too strong to be resisted; the children born *must* be brought up Protestants, and thus settlements of this religion are every where springing up amidst the Catholic population, which of course will engross all government patronage, and, by farther intermarriages, propagate their creed. In 1825, by an order, dated August 17th, this law was extended to the Rhenish provinces, and severe denunciations were sent forth against such Catholic ecclesiastics as should venture to have the children all brought up in their religion.

But a curious document has come to light upon this subject. In 1831, the government printed a large work, entitled "Revision of the laws." It is a collection of private instructions for the local authorities, upon the meaning and spirit of the laws;

and a copy having strayed among the uninitiated, was employed by Dr. Benkert in his "*Religions Freund*," for the detection of the views entertained by the Prussian government. Among other things, we are here expressly assured, § 42, that "the alteration of the law," above rehearsed, "was made as an effectual measure against the proselyting system of Catholics,"—a candid acknowledgment of the purpose which we have attributed to the government, the prevention of the fair growth of Catholicity. But there are several curious cases of application given to guide the decisions of magistrates, a few of which, as striking specimens of impartial justice, we must transcribe.

Case 1. Two Protestants, whose wives, and consequently daughters (according to the first law), were Catholics, upon the death of the former, wished to bring up the latter Protestants. This was against § 76; but in defiance of the remonstrances of the priest, was decided in their favour, on the ground, that in § 44, it was decreed that no *third* person should interfere between the married couple! A decision worthy of Sancho, when governor of his island. The mother being dead, who was the *second* party?

Case 2. In Erfurt, a man died, and left *all* his children Catholics, according to the second law there in force. The Protestant widow, desired to have them brought up Protestants. On the 15th of May, 1825, the minister of justice refused her prayer, as contrary to law; but on the 25th of August, the King granted it, derogating from the law, in her favour, and exempting her from its operation.

Case 3. The *reformed* widow of a Lutheran husband became a Catholic. The daughters had been baptised by reformed or Lutheran clergymen; and she now wished to use her right of bringing them up in her own religion. This, however, was opposed as a case not provided for by law. In England, parental rights, and the manifest analogy of law, would have prevailed. Not so in Prussia. It was decided that the persuasion in which the father died must be respected, and the daughters brought up in the religion wherein they had been baptised.

We are no lawyers, and therefore we leave discussions upon these decisions to such as are. All we can say is, that, if there be warrant for them in law, to our minds there is but little justice.

The laws to which we have hitherto referred, concern matters common to both religions; they are those, consequently, in which the equality guaranteed by treaty and law should most naturally and most forcibly have been exhibited. The old law forbade the yoking of two animals of unequal dimensions to one plough,

as symbolical of the injustice of an unequal pressure of the law upon men who, drawing the same weight, should all bear their due proportion :—how this symbol is verified in Prussia, the foregoing statements may well declare.—We have been so diffuse upon this part of our subject, that we must give but a hurried sketch of those laws which are framed for the special *comfort* of Catholics exclusively.

First: All direct communication between the Catholics and the Holy See is expressly forbidden, and the prohibition is strictly enforced. All enquiries which a bishop may wish to make of the Sovereign Pontiff, on matters innumerable concerning his diocese, must pass through the hands of a Protestant ministry, and be forwarded or not, according to its discretion. The matter of consultation may regard one of the many painful situations in which the government enactments have placed him or his clergy: there is no remedy: all must be forwarded through the same channel. The Papal answer is subject to the same ordeal, and is not admitted without a royal *placet*. Hence it frequently happens, either that letters fail to reach the Pope, or that their answers never arrive at their destination. A curious case of not very creditable interference with such important correspondence, is mentioned by our author. The government very properly wished to have some uniformity regarding the observance of festivals, which differed in the various provinces, and in some were considered too numerous. The Archbishop of Cologne was desired to make out a list of such as he thought should be kept; and this, when ready, he sent to Berlin, to be thence forwarded through the usual channel to Rome, for the approbation of the reigning Pontiff, Leo XII. But by some unaccountable means the list was swelled, on its way, by the insertion of the *Lutheran* day of prayer and expiation! Not aware, however, of this fact, and with nothing in the document to mark the real character of the day, the Pope naturally supposed it to be some peculiar local observance, and immediately approved it. Judge of the indignation felt by the Archbishop at this unworthy trick, and at finding himself commanded to enjoin the observance of a festival, hitherto emphatically and exclusively Protestant! He had, however, no resource; the festival must be observed; and he, therefore, adopted the expedient of ordering the day to be kept as a day of supplication against storms and blights, and for the preservation of the fruits of the earth.

Secondly. The election of bishops is reduced to a mere mockery. A royal commissary honours the chapter with his presence, and informs it of the person whom alone the king will approve. The



understanding is distinct, that, till the party thus nominated is elected, the see will be kept vacant.

Thirdly. The bishop is in a state of absolute dependence and constraint. He receives constant orders through the High President; and cannot publish any new regulations or provisions without the revisal and approval of that officer. We are told that the late bishop of Culm, Dr. Von Mathey, was so sick of government dispatches and orders, that, for many years, he never opened one; and several drawers full of papers, thus unopened, were discovered after his death.

Fourthly. The appointment to vacant prebends is reserved by the Papal Brief, dated in 1821, and admitted by the government, to the Pope, or bishop, as the case may be. The king, however, fills them all up.

Fifthly. In fine, not to multiply examples, the interference of government goes so far, that all the minutiae of Catholic worship are subject to the control of its lay agents; nay, a Protestant councillor has to decide how much wine, and how many hosts, are to be used throughout the year, in the Catholic Church!

But of this enough. We know not our countrymen, if their indignation and their sympathy be not aroused by the unadorned statements which we have made. Will it be said that Prussia is a Protestant country, and therefore is right in procuring the ascendancy of its own religion? If so, we ask, in reply, 'what constitutes a Protestant country? That the reigning house be Protestant? Then, is Saxony, where the royal family is Catholic, though the subjects are Protestant, to be considered a Catholic state? Or is Belgium Protestant, because Leopold is a Lutheran? The house of Brandenburg, till 1539, was Catholic; then, till 1613, Lutheran; from that year, till 1740, reformed or Calvinistical: from 1740 to 1786, avowedly infidel, the ally of Voltaire and D'Alembert; again, till 1817, reformed, and now evangelical. And did the nation change its denomination, according to all the varieties of religious hues, through which the reigning house, however conscientiously, has passed?

But such a line of reasoning could not for a moment be maintained. Is Prussia, then, we ask, a Protestant country, because Protestantism, to use the terms of the new French charter, is "the religion of the majority (in this instance, a small majority indeed) of the nation"? As well might we say that we have a right to consider the islands of Malta or Trinidad Protestant, because they have been aggregated to a state in which the total majority is Protestant, although express stipulations have secured to them the maintenance

intact of the Catholic religion. In like manner, Westphalia, Sillesia, and the Rhine, have been added to Prussia, under the most sacred pledges, that their religion was to be preserved Catholic,—and, whatever may be said of Prussia, these provinces, so long as there exists national honour, are and must be essentially Catholic. But then, even Prussia cannot be called a constitutionally Protestant country, as England is; for, the law places the three religions, the Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Reformed, on a footing of perfect equality. Now, it is the law which decides this important point, and here the law is clear and undisputed.

It is, then, in defiance of law, or, if you please, of acknowledged rights, that this galling, harassing, and paltry system of persecution has been devised and carried on. Shall we be told, that persecution is too hard a name? Nay, in our estimation, it is scarcely adequate to the description of the fact. The term has, indeed, been applied to the attempt, made of old, to exterminate religion through the sufferings and the martyrdom of its professors. The foolish tyrants of ancient days knew not that religion has a life of its own, independent of that possessed or lost by any given number of its followers. They knew not the refinement, which aimed directly at her own vitality, while it left her outward members comparatively unmolested. But the tyrants of modern times are wiser in their generation. Instead of manifesting their jealousy of religion, by butchering her children, they take the readier and less revolting course, of smothering herself, like Desdemona, upon a bed of down, with the very means intended for her repose!

We know that the Catholics of Prussia feel sincere respect for the personal character of their monarch. All allow that he is just and generous; and we do not believe that he is conscious of having given pain. It is not of him, therefore, that we have ever meant to speak, in any severe animadversions which may have escaped our pen. It is that indefinite, vague, unapprehensible thing, called the Government, that we have intended to reprehend: to it must be allotted the blame, as to it must be attributed the measures.

But the title of the book before us suggests other and painful reflections:—"Materials for the Church History of the Nineteenth Century." And will it be of such materials as these, that the future historian of the Church, in this age of intellectual refinement, will compose his pages? And will such be the annals of Protestantism—of that meek and gentle Protestantism, which boasteth, that, till she came on earth, the principles and practice of religious toleration were unknown among the sons of men? After a period of three hundred years,—just the term required to

consolidate Christianity, and enable her, after trampling on the bloody fasces, to lean on the dove-topped sceptre of the empire,—shall *she* be found in every quarter of the world, still carrying on the frightful system of pushing down foes, or supplanting rivals, merely to keep herself upon her feet? Shall the gatherer of such materials, for the history of Protestantism in the nineteenth century, have to track her in Ireland riding on her pale horse, over the mud-cabins of a Catholic population, bruising limbs, and breaking hearts, and desolating homes, with the brazen hoof of her courser? Shall he, on the Continent, see her twining herself, in a cold and withering embrace, round her whom she pretends to call a sister, and this only to suck the blood from her veins, and the marrow from her bones, by codes, calculated to weary the endurance, and to waste, in hectic decay, the religious feeling of entire provinces? Or, if he cross the ocean to the islands of our antipodes, shall he find her in power over savages, whom she has civilized, but never elevated, and using that power through her emissaries, to persecute, with chains and hard labour, those who embrace the Catholic faith? And when he has seen these things, and set them, like a rich mosaic, in his storied page, shall he smile or weep, as he writes over it, “On the tolerant, unpersecuting principles of Protestantism, in the nineteenth century”!

We are not vain enough to think that these pages are likely to meet the eye of many of our fellow-religionists, in the country whereof they treat. And if they do, shall we presume to offer them counsel or consolation? Most assuredly not; while there is One, “who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks,” that saith to them, “I know your works, and your labour, and your patience; and you *have* patience, and have borne for my name, and have not failed.” They will continue, we doubt not, as heretofore, to edify the Christian world by their unwearied endurance, at the same time that they adorn their religion by the numerous instances of noble and honourably applied talents, which, in spite of their humiliation, they have continued to present to mankind. Whatever the sympathy of brethren, who have suffered even more than they, can do, to comfort and encourage them; whatever of hope the marvellous work of their liberation, through peaceful and lawful means, may afford, they certainly will ever find in the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland. Let us feel towards each other as friends and brethren, and let the bond of common suffering wind itself round the sacred links of a common faith. There is no uniter of hearts like the chain of persecution.

---

ART. VIII.—*Sketches of English Literature, with Considerations on the Spirit of the Times, Men, and Revolutions.* By the Visc. de Chateaubriand. 2 vols. 8vo. Colburn, London. 1836.

THIS title is, in its leading part, calculated to deceive; for though we are supplied with some Sketches of English Literature, generally very incorrect, the greater part of the work is occupied by sombre political reflections, and personal anecdotes of the author, thrown together without any order. In his preface he says :—

“This view of English Literature, which is to precede my translation of Milton, consists of

“1. Some detached pieces of my early studies, corrected in style, rectified with regard to opinions, enlarged or condensed as relates to the text.

“2. Various extracts from my Memoirs; extracts which happened to be connected directly with the Work which I here submit to the public.

“3. Recent researches relative to the subject of these volumes.”

“I have visited the United States; I have lived eight years an exile in England; after residing in London as an emigrant, I have returned thither as ambassador. I believe that I am as thoroughly acquainted with English, as a man can be with a language foreign to his own.” *Preface*, p. 1.

In one of Miss Edgeworth's novels, that lady admirably sketches the character of Frank Clay, who is always talking of his own adventures, and generally opens his stories with the introduction, “When I was abroad with the Princess Orbitella.” The Princess Orbitella of Chateaubriand is his Embassy to London: he has never written a book since, in which it is not referred to, whenever he can find, or make, an opportunity for its introduction. We have it here for example, in the very first page of the first volume :—amid the closing pages of the second, we find,

“In 1822, at the time of my embassy to London, the fashionable was expected to exhibit, at the first glance, an unhappy and unhealthy man; to have an air of negligence about his person, long nails, a beard neither entire nor shaven, but as if grown for a moment unawares, and forgotten during the preoccupations of wretchedness; hair in disorder; a sublime, wild, wicked eye; lips compressed in disdain of human nature; a Byronian heart, overwhelmed with weariness and disgust of life.”—Vol. ii. p. 303.

For the sake of the contrast, we are as continually reminded of the time of “my exile in England.” His critique upon Lord Byron is marked by that memorable epoch :—

"In the earliest compositions of Lord Byron, we meet with striking imitations of the 'Minstrel.' At the period of my exile in England, Lord Byron was at the school of Harrow, a village about ten miles from London."—*Vol. ii. p. 390.*

In the very last page of the second volume, we have the same date:—

"When at the beginning of my life, England afforded me an asylum, I translated some of Milton's verses, to supply the wants of the exile: now, having returned to my country, drawing near to the end of my career, I again have recourse to the poet of Eden."—*Vol. ii. p. 361.*

The exile and the embassy haunt us from the beginning to the end of the Viscount's labours. He would find it impossible to write a treatise on the differential calculus, or to follow Ephraim Jenkison in his researches into cosmogony, without reminding us that he had been an emigrant, and an ambassador. It bursts forth on every occasion: but we shall trouble our readers with only one passage more:—

"Political eloquence may be considered as constituting part of British Literature. I have had opportunities of forming my opinion upon it at two very different periods of my life.

"The England of 1688 was, about the end of the last century, at the apogee of its glory. As a poor emigrant in London from 1792 to 1800, I listened to the speeches of the Pitts, the Foxes, the Sheridans, the Wilberforces, the Grenvilles, the Whitbreads, the Lauderdales, the Erskines: as a magnificent ambassador in 1822, I cannot express how I was struck, when, instead of the great speakers whom I had formerly admired, I saw those who had been their seconds at the time of my first visit, the scholars, rise instead of the masters."—*Vol. II. p. 274.*

It would not be easy to find any logical connexion between the position of the Viscount de Chateaubriand, whether as a poor emigrant, or "a magnificent ambassador," in 1822, (the date of that never to be forgotten period is always carefully noted) with the decline and fall of British oratory. Had the state of affairs been reversed, had he shone in all the lustre of diplomacy in 1792, and sought an asylum in poverty and exile, in 1822, we apprehend that, momentous as the event might seem to the Viscount, the tide of our senatorial eloquence would have ebbed and flowed as it has done, uninfluenced by any mutation of our author's fortunes.

It is, however, magnanimous in him to exalt the era of Pitt; for that statesman, it appears, was not instinctively, or rather prophetically, impressed with a sense of the future greatness of the Viscount. He actually passed him in St. James's Park without notice!

"I frequently saw Pitt walking across St. James's Park, from his own house to the palace. On his part, George III. arrived from

Windsor, after drinking beer out of a pewter pot with the farmers of the neighbourhood; he drove through the mean courts of his mean habitation, in a grey chariot—followed by a few of the Horse Guards. This was the master of the kings of Europe, as five or six merchants of the city are the masters of India. Pitt, dressed in black, with a steel-hilted sword by his side, hat under his arm, ascended, taking two or three steps at a time. In his passage, he only met with three or four emigrants, who had nothing to do: casting on us a disdainful look, he turned up his nose and his pale face, and passed on.”—Vol. II. p. 277.

‘This was in 1792: but mark the change:—’

“In the month of June 1822, Lord Liverpool took me to dine at his country house. As we crossed Putney Heath, he showed me the small house where the son of Lord Chatham, the statesman who had had Europe in his pay, and distributed with his own hand all the treasures of the world, died in poverty.”—Vol. II. p. 278.

The “magnificent ambassador,” driving out to dine with the living prime minister of England, could afford to return the disdainful look, cast upon the poor emigrant by the dead premier, some thirty years before.

Let it not, however, be imagined that M. de Chateaubriand shines only as a diplomatist. He is also a Lord among wits, and in a comparison, which he institutes between himself and Lord Byron, fails not to draw our notice to the fact.

“Some interest will, perhaps, be felt on remarking in future—if I am destined to have any future—the coincidence presented by the two leaders of the new French and English schools, having one and the same fund of ideas, and destinies, if not manners, nearly similar: the one a peer of England, the other a peer of France; both travellers in the East, at no great distance of time from each other, but who never met. The only difference is, that the life of the English poet was not mixed up with such great events as mine.

“Lord Byron went to visit, after me, the ruins of Greece: in “Childe Harold” he seems to embellish with his own colours the descriptions of my “Travels.” At the commencement of my pilgrimage, I introduced the farewell of Sire de Joinville to his castle: Byron, in like manner, bids adieu to his Gothic habitation.”—p. 334.

The French peer certainly surpasses the British peer in one point. Lord Byron had no contemptible opinion of his own powers; but he never coolly wrote himself down as the leader of the existing school of his country. The Viscount, we see, has no such scruple.

But Byron is no favourite: on the contrary, he is to be regarded as a pilferer. After having whimsically described “The Martyrs” and “The Letter on the Campagna of Rome” as the true sources of his lordship’s inspiration, our author adds, that “the bard of Childe Harold belongs to the family of René.”

"In the 'Martyrs' Eudorus sets out from Messenia to proceed to Rome.—'Our voyage,' he says, 'was long. We saw all those promontories marked by temples or tombs. . . . We crossed the gulf of Megara. Before us was Ægina, on the right the Piræus, on the left Corinth. Those cities, of old so flourishing, exhibited only heaps of ruins. The very sailors appeared to be moved by this sight. The crowd, collected upon the deck, kept silence: each fixed his eyes steadfastly on those ruins: each perhaps drew from them in secret a consolation in his misfortunes, by reflecting how trifling are our own afflictions compared with those calamities which befal whole nations, and which had stretched before our eyes the corpses of those cities. . . My young companions had never heard of any other metamorphoses than those of Jupiter, and could not account for the ruins before their eyes: I, for my part, had already seated myself with the prophet on the ruins of desolate cities, and Babylon taught me what had happened to Corinth.'

"Now turn to the fourth canto of Lord Byron's *Childe Harold*:

'As my bark did skim  
The bright blue waters with a fanning wind,  
Came Megara before me, and behind  
Ægina lay, Piræus on the right,  
And Coriuth on the left.' "I lay reclined  
Along the prow, and saw all these unite  
In ruin.  
The Roman saw these tombs in his own age,  
These sepulchres of cities, which excite  
Sad wonder, and this yet surviving page  
The moral lesson bears, drawn from such pilgrimage.'"—pp. 334-336.

That the passages are coincident is true enough; but we hardly think that either Lord Byron or M. de Chateaubriand can claim their parentage. The Viscount hastily refers to the letter of Sulpicius to Cicero, where they will be found almost word for word; but he does not refer to the fact, that Lord Byron acknowledges the source in the lines immediately preceding those above-quoted, and cites the whole passage in a note:

"Wandering in youth, I traced the path of him,  
The Roman friend of Rome's least mortal mind,  
The friend of Tully."

If his lordship had not read Sulpicius in the original, or in Dr. Middleton, he need not have gone farther than *Tristram Shandy*, where Mr. Shandy, the elder, quotes it with much philosophical pathos on the occasion of the death of his son Bobby.

One great question remains without a satisfactory explanation. We give it in M. de Chateaubriand's own words:—

"If it be true that 'Réné' had some influence upon the character of the single person brought forward under different names by the author of *Childe Harold*, Conrad, Lara, Manfred, the Giaour; if it so

happened that Lord Byron has made me live with his life; could he have had the weakness never to mention me? Am I, then, one of those fathers whom one denies when one has arrived at power? Is it possible that I can have been wholly unknown to Lord Byron, though he quotes almost all the French authors, his contemporaries? Could it be that he never heard of me, though the English journals, like the French, rang for twenty years around him with the controversy on my works, and though the 'New Times' drew a comparison between the author of the 'Génie du Christianisme' and the author of 'Childe Harold'?

"There is no nature, how highly favoured soever it may be, but has its susceptibilities, its distrusts: one is anxious to retain the sceptre; one has a dread of sharing it; one is irritated by comparisons. Thus another superior talent has avoided my name in a work on *literature*. Thank God! though estimating myself at my proper value, I have never laid claim to empire; as I believe in nothing but religious truth, of which liberty is a form, I have no more faith in myself than in any thing else here below. But I have never felt any necessity to keep silence when I have admired: hence it is that I proclaim my enthusiasm for Madame de Stael and for Lord Byron."—pp. 337-8.

That Lord Byron should not have read the critique of the "New Times," is an event which might justly excite the indignation of Sir John Stoddart—a reason, however, is suggested for his unjustifiable conduct.

"For the rest, a document would decide the question, were I in possession of one. On the appearance of 'Atala,' I received a letter from Cambridge, signed 'G. Gordon, Lord Byron.' Lord Byron, at the age of fifteen, was a star that had not yet risen: thousands of letters of censure or congratulation overwhelmed me; twenty secretaries would not have been sufficient to keep pace with this immense correspondence; I was compelled therefore to throw into the fire three-fourths of these letters, and to select only such as it was most incumbent on me to return thanks for, or to defend myself against. I have some recollection, however, that I answered Lord Byron; but it is also possible that the note of the Cambridge student shared the general fate. In this case, my forced unpoliteness may have been construed into an affront by an irascible mind, and he may have punished my silence by his own. How deeply have I since regretted the loss of the glorious lines of the early youth of a great poet!"—pp. 338-9.

There is something *naïve* in the opening sentence: "for the rest [a vile Gallicism by the way] a document would decide the question, *were I in possession of one*." If a man has a document that will decide, it is clearly a decisive document; but, if he has it not, why—the matter remains as before. We regret to say, that the existence of the document, at any time, appears to us extremely dubious. In spite of all his correspondence, which must have equalled that of old Solomon in "The Stranger," the Viscount fails to observe how English noblemen sign their letters. We know



that they order these things differently in France ; but we should as soon expect to see such a signature as "George Gordon, Lord Byron," as to get a letter from the hero of Waterloo, subscribed, "Arthur Wellesley, Duke of Wellington, Marquis of Douro," and so on, to the end of his Grace's voluminous titles. But supposing it correct in all particulars, this story only solves half the phenomenon—we are left in the dark as to the mysterious cause of the silence of Madame de Stael. Why did she never mention the name of the leader of the French school ? It is inexplicable.

He has, however, his consolation in the general interest which he inspires all over the globe. He rivals the fame of the Wandering Jew.

"Travels!—delightful word!—it reminds me of my whole life. The Americans are pleased to consider me as the bard of their ancient forests : and Abou Gosh, the Arab, still remembers my excursion in the mountains of Judea. I opened the door of the East to Lord Byron, and to the travellers who have since me visited the Cephisus, the Jordan, and the Nile—a numerous posterity, whom I have sent to Egypt as Jacob sent thither his sons. My old and young friends have enlarged the narrow path left by my passage. M. Michaud, the last pilgrim of his crusades, has beheld the holy sepulchre ; M. Lenormant has explored the tombs of Thebes, to preserve for us the language of Champollion ; he has seen that liberty reviving amidst the ruins of Greece which I there saw expiring under the turban, intoxicated with fanaticism, opium, and women. My footsteps in every country have been effaced by other footsteps : it is only in the dust of Carthage that they have remained solitary, like the vestiges of a son of the desert on the snows of Canada. Even in the savannahs of Atala, the herbage has given place to cultivated crops ; three high-roads now lead to the Natchez, and if Chactas were still living, he might be a deputy to the congress at Washington. Nay, more—I have received a Cherokee pamphlet, in which those savages compliment me in English, as an 'eminent writer and conductor of the public press.'"—pp. 282-3.

After this, why need he disturb his mind with any recollections of the unjust silence of Lord Byron and Madame de Stael ?—Abou Gosh and the Cherokee pamphleteer are more adequate judges of fame and genius than Childe Harold or Corinne.

If we can manage it, however, we will turn from M. de Chateaubriand himself, to his opinions on our literature. It is not very easy to find them. In the first volume, about fifty pages are consumed in discussions, generally inexact, and always flimsy, on the Latin language, and the manners of the middle ages ; and then we are at once introduced to a very surprising pair of English authors, Tacitus and Ossian ! Tacitus is pressed into our literature on the strength of the speech of Galgacus, which the Vis-

count seems to think is substantially well reported; but, from the period of the report, a melancholy chasm occurs. "Fifteen centuries pass before we again hear of the genius of the Britons, and then how?" Aye! how, indeed? Why, in Macpherson's Ossian! We rather think that the interval between Tacitus and Macpherson is something more than fifteen centuries; but let that pass. We recommend the assertion to the peculiar indignation of Wales. Was the voice of the bards of Britain silent for fifteen centuries?

"Hear from thy grave, great Taliesi hear:  
It breathes a sound to animate thy clay."

We devote the Viscount to the Cymrodorion, who will be the more enraged, when they find that he confounds the Danish scalds with their bards, and is under an impression, that Danish, Anglo-Saxon, and Welsh literature, may be safely confounded together.—(pp. 53-63.)

We are then entertained with dissertations on the Norman period, and the struggle between the French and English languages, derived from the most ordinary and trivial sources. Chaucer, Gower, and Barbour, are dismissed in five pages, to make room for an essay on politics. James the First of Scotland is hastily set aside to introduce that very authentic ballad, "Sir Cauline;" and to favour us with a criticism on Childe Waters, who, as well as René, is an original, it seems, of Childe Harold. Such is the Viscount's sketch of our literature from Tacitus to the House of Tudor. The introduction of the princes of that house affords a pretext for a series of rambling remarks on the Reformation. Here three or four dozen pages are devoted to Luther, whose only direct interference with English literature was his controversy with Henry VIII, in 1522, a period which Chateaubriand ought to have remarked as being exactly 300 years before his own appearance as "a magnificent ambassador in London." Hasty notices of Henry's own career as an author, of Surrey, and of Sir Thomas More, bring us to the reign of Elizabeth. One sentence is, perhaps, worth quoting, as a specimen of the information displayed in this portion of the work:—

"Within an interval of twenty-five years, at the period here referred to, prose was less successfully cultivated than poetry. It would be difficult to derive either profit or pleasure from a perusal of the writings of Wolsey, Cranmer, Habington, Drummond, and Joseph Hall, the preacher."—Vol. I. p. 221. •

We can hardly look upon Wolsey or Cranmer as professed authors; but it is pleasant enough to find William Habington, the author of *Castara*, who flourished in the reign of Charles the

First, Drummond, of Hawthornden, the friend of Ben Jonson, and Bishop Hall, the satirist, who is, we suppose, the person who figures here under the title of "Joseph Hall, the preacher," described as the dull prosers of the days of Henry VIII.

Spenser is allowed three pages; and Shakspeare then appears. The Viscount is pleased to express a more favourable opinion now, than what he had formerly entertained; and yet he is not over-complimentary even as it is. Hamlet, for example, is described as

"That tragedy of maniacs, that *royal bedlam*, in which every character is either crazy or criminal, in which feigned madness is added to real madness, and in which the grave itself furnishes the stage with the skull of a fool; in that Odeon of shadows and spectres where we hear nothing but reveries, the challenge of sentinels, the screeching of the night bird, and the roaring of the sea."—Vol. I. p. 274.

The young female characters of Shakspeare,

"Are all mere girls, and, setting apart the shades of difference between the characters of daughter, mother, and wife, they all resemble each other as closely as twin sisters: nay, have the same smile, the same look, the same tone of voice. If we could forget their names, and close our eyes, we should not know which of them was speaking—their language is more elegiac than dramatic."—Vol. I. p. 280.

And we are asked,

"What are all Shakspeare's females in comparison with Esther?"

"Est-ce toi, chère Elise? O jour trois fois heureux!  
Que béni soit le ciel qui te rend à mes vœux!  
Toi, qui, de Benjamin comme moi descendue,  
Fus de mes premiers ans la compagne assidue,  
Et qui, d'un même joug souffrant l'oppression,  
M'aidais à soupirer les malheurs de Sion.

\* \* \* \* \*

On m'élevait alors solitaire et cachée,  
Sous les yeux vigilans du sage Mardochée." &c. &c.

Vol. I. p. 284.

After quoting the remainder of this passage, as far as

"Venez, venez, mes filles,  
Compagnes autrefois de ma captivité,  
De l'antique Jacob jeune postérité,"—

The critic exclaims

"If there are any Huns, Hottentots, Hurons, Goths, Vandals, or other barbarians, insensible to the feminine modesty, the dignity, and the melody of this exquisite passage, may they be seventy times seven-fold delighted by the charms of their own native productions." Vol. I. p. 284.

That there are many beautiful passages in *Esther*, and in all *Racine's* works, it would be Hunnish and Hottentotish to deny. But we hope that we shall escape the charge of ultra barbarism, if we venture to think that we have read lines, in other languages, at least equal to this lauded speech. But why compare at all? *Voltaire* has well said, that the taste for making comparisons is the taste of a little mind. *Racine* has his own merits, without there being any necessity of bringing him into collision with *Shakspeare*. On the whole, the criticism of the Viscount is a mass of unmeaning verbiage, out of which it is impossible to extract a sentence worthy of the slightest notice. In his account of *Shakspeare*, he has gathered all the idle anecdotes, which make up the bulk of his scanty memoirs. He boldly sets him down as a butcher in his youth; is quite certain that he held horses at the playhouse door; that he was a buffoon player; that he performed *Falstaff*, (this discovery belongs to the Viscount himself;) that he was despised by *Elizabeth* and *James*; that *Ben Jonson* was his constant detractor; and so forth. He has a long lamentation over the poverty in which the poet died,—the fact being, that he possessed property equivalent to £750 a-year of our present money. He conjectures that he was lame, not of the leg, but of the hand:—the subject is somewhat obscure; but a reader of the sonnets ought to have remembered his bidding his mistress

“Talk of my lameness and I straight will halt.”—

But it is useless to pursue the task of pointing out the eternal blunders which appear in every page of a gentleman so “thoroughly acquainted with our language and literature.”

The *Basilicon Doron* of *James the First* next occupies, and at an unusual length, the pages of a literary historian who does not even mention the name of *Bacon*! By some strange fate, we have, in the midst of discussions on the fate of the *Stuarts*, a rhapsody of the *Abbé de la Mennais*, which our author, with very questionable taste, asks if he may not call “a detached parable from the *Sermon on the Mount*.”

The second volume brings us to *Milton*. We shall not detain our readers with this portion of the Viscount's labours, particularly as *M. de Chateaubriand* promises another opportunity for criticism, by presenting us with a translation of *Paradise Lost*. He possesses one main qualification for a translator, a warm enthusiasm for his author; but we doubt whether he has either the knowledge or the vigour requisite for the task. At all events, however, he cannot “do it into French” more tamely than *De Lille*.—By the way, is it not somewhat amusing, to find him, in the midst of his zeal for *Milton*, pausing to quote a forgotten

speech of his own, delivered in the Chamber of Peers, some ten years ago, on the liberation of Greece?

Comparisons between the French and English revolutions, between Cromwell and Buonaparte, between the Puritans and the Jacobins, including a special chapter upon Danton, and a long account of the escape of Charles II, after the battle of Worcester, immediately succeed. As may be expected, the hero of the work is not forgotten. The mention of Lovelace and his captivity introduces an anecdote of Chateaubriand.

"Without being young and handsome, like Colonel Lovelace, I have been, like him, incarcerated. The governments which ruled France from 1800 to 1830 had exercised some forbearance towards a votary of the muses; Bonaparte, whom I had fiercely attacked in the *Mercur*, was at first prompted to despatch me; he raised his sword, but he struck not.

"A generous and liberal administration, exclusively composed of literary men, of poets, writers, editors of newspapers, has proved less ceremonious towards an old comrade.

"My kennel, somewhat longer than it was broad, was seven or eight feet high. The stained and bare wainscôt was covered with the poetry and prose scrawled upon it by my predecessors. A pallet with soiled sheets occupied three parts of my habitation; a board supported by two trestles, placed against the wall at an elevation of two feet above the bed, served the purpose of a press for the linen, boots, and shoes of the prisoner. A chair, a table, and a small cask, as a disgusting convenience, formed the remainder of the furniture. A grated window opened at a considerable height; I was forced to mount upon the table in order to breathe fresh air, and to enjoy the light of heaven. I could only distinguish, through the bars of my felon's cage, a gloomy narrow court, and dark buildings, round which the bats kept fluttering. I heard the clank of keys and chains, the noise of the *sergens de ville* and spies, the pacing of soldiers, the ground of arms, the shrieks, the laughter, the obscene licentious songs of the prisoners, my neighbours; the howlings of Benoit, condemned to death as the murderer of his mother, and of his obscene friend. I could distinguish these words of Benoit, amidst his confused exclamations of fear and repentance: 'Alas! my mother! my poor mother!' I beheld the wrong side of society, the sons of humanity, the hideous machinery, which sets in motion this world, so smiling to look at in front, when the curtain is raised.

"The genius of my former greatness and of my *glory*, represented by a life of thirty years, did not make its appearance before me; but my Muse of former days, poor and humble as she was, came all radiant to embrace me through my window; she was delighted with my abode, and full of inspiration; she found me again, as she had seen me in London, in the days of my poverty, when the first dreams of René were floating in my mind. What were we, the solitary of Pindus and I, about to produce together? A song, in the style of Lovelace. Upon whom? Upon a king? Assuredly not! The voice of a

prisoner would have been of bad omen: it is only from the foot of our altars that hymns should be addressed to misfortune. None, moreover, but a poet of great renown can be listened to when he sings;

‘ O toi, de ma pitié profonde  
Reçois l’hommage solennel.  
Humble objet des regards du monde,  
Privé du regard paternel !  
Puisses tu, né dans la souffrance,  
Et de ta mère et de la France  
Consoler la longue douleur !’\*

“ My song was not therefore of a crown fallen from an innocent brow; I was content with celebrating a different crown—a white one, too, laid on the coffin of a young maiden.†

‘ Tu dors, pauvre Elisa, si légère d’années !  
Tu ne sens plus du jour le poids et la chaleur :  
Vous avez achevé vos fraîches matinées,  
Jeune fille et jeune fleur !’

“ The prefect of police, with whose behaviour I have every reason to be satisfied, offered me a more suitable asylum, as soon as he was made acquainted with the agreeable abode which the friends of the liberty of the press had considerably assigned to me, for having availed myself of that liberty. The window of my new dwelling opened upon a cheerful garden. It was not enlivened by the warbling of Lovelace’s linnet; but it abounded in frisky, light, chirping, bold, quarrelsome sparrows: they are found everywhere,—in the country, in town, on the balustrades of a mansion, along the gutters of a prison; they perch quite as cheerfully upon the instruments of death as upon a rose bush. What matter the sufferings of earth to those who can fly away further.

“ My song will not be more lasting than that of Lovelace. The Jacobites have left nothing to England but the anthem *God save the King*. The origin of this air is not uninteresting: it is ascribed to Lulli; the young maids, in the choruses to *Esther*, delighted, at St. Cyr, the ears and the pride of the great monarch by the strains of the *Domine salvum fac regem*. The attendants of James carried to their country the majestic invocation: they addressed it to the God of armies, when they marched to battle in defence of their banished sovereign. Struck with the beauty of this loyal song, the English of William’s faction appropriated it to themselves. It became an appendage to the usurpation and to the sovereignty of the people, who are ignorant at this day, that they are singing a foreign air, the hymn of the Stuarts, the canticle of divine right and of legitimacy. How long will England yet implore the Ruler of the world to *save the king*? Reckon the revolutions heaped up in a dozen notes, which have outlived these revolutions!

“ The *Domine salvum* of the Catholic rite is, likewise, an admirable song: it was sung in Greek in the tenth century, when the hippodrome was graced with the emperor’s presence. From the pageant it was transferred to the church: another era that has passed away.”—Vol. ii. pp. 190-4.

\* V. Hugo, *Odes et Ballades*.

† Elisa Trisel.

The history of our literature, from the restoration, occupies no great quantity of space, and the criticisms which it embodies, are certainly of the most trifling description. Some odd mistakes occur, such as placing Denham and Otway among the writers subsequent to the accession of the House of Hanover, ascribing to Francis the authorship of the "Art of Poetry," which he translated from Horace, and making the first Earl of Shaftesbury a licentious poet:—but it is hard to avoid some slips in writing on foreign literature, and especially when we have to deal with writers so careless of every thing but effect. The arrangements of our dramatic authors is diverting enough, to deserve to be extracted.

"Shirley, Davenant, Otway, Congreve, Farquhar, Cibber, Steele, Colman, Foote, Rowe, Addison, Moore, Aaron Hill, Sheridan, Coleridge, &c., exhibit the succession of English dramatic poets up to the present day. Tobin, Joanna Baillie, and a few others have attempted to revive the old style, and the old theatrical forms."—Vol. ii. p. 201.

M de Chateaubriand is unquestionably a man of talent, but he sadly over-rates himself. He wants exactness and critical reading for the fit execution of such a work as that which we have been reviewing. Even when, instead of passing opinions on the literary history of others, he enters the walks of literature as an author, not a critic, his style is disfigured by that species of pseudo-eloquence which his countrymen call *phébus*; while his ideas are for ever clouded, for ever rendered uncertain and indistinct, by the mystic and mouthing enthusiasm in which they are clothed. Vanity is his besetting sin. If he would allow us to forget the magnificence of his embassy to London, in 1822, after having formerly appeared there as a poor emigrant, we should look upon him with more partial eyes.—But we suppose that is impossible.

---

NOTE.—We find the following in p. 208, vol. ii.—He has been speaking of the calamities to which so many men of letters have been subjected.

"In the cloisters of the Cathedral of Worcester, the stranger's notice is attracted by a sepulchral slab, without date, without a prayer, without a symbol; its only inscription is the word *Miserrimus*. Could this unknown, this nameless *Miserrimus* have been any other than a man of genius?"—Vol. ii, p. 208.

We have understood that this *Miserrimus* was a clergyman of the parish, who had been involved in perpetual legal quarrels with his parishioners, that rendered him, in his own opinion, at least, the most miserable of mankind. We do not vouch for the authenticity of the story. A melo-dramatic romance has been suggested to Mr. F. M. Reynolds by this tombstone. His book is called "*Miserrimus*." It is now forgotten, but we may be sure that it was there M. de Chateaubriand found the story.

---

ART. IX.—1. *The Edinburgh Review on Absenteeism.* (No. 85, Nov. 1825.)

2. *Evidence of J. R. M'Culloch, Esq. before the Committee of 1830, on the State of the Irish Poor.* (Third Report of Evidence, ordered to be printed, July 16, . . .)

“**A**BSENTEE,” is a term which appears to have derived its origin from the anomalies of Ireland. Johnson says it is “a word used commonly with regard to Irishmen living out of their country;” and he quotes a passage from Sir John Davis, on Ireland, in which reference is made to a statute passed against absentees in the third year of Richard the Second. He also quotes a sentence from Child’s Discourse on Trade, in which it is asserted, that “a great part of estates in Ireland are owned by *absentees*, and such as draw over the profits raised out of Ireland, refunding nothing.”

The foundation of the absenteeism, which is so peculiar to Ireland, was laid in the earliest times of the British connection. Sir John Davis, after noticing that “the kings of England, who, in former ages, attempted the conquest of Ireland, being ill-advised and counselled by the great men here, did not, upon the submissions of the Irish, communicate their laws unto them, nor admit them to the state and condition of free subjects,” says, that “the next error in the civil polity, which hindered the perfection of the conquest of Ireland, did consist in the distribution of the lands and possessions, which were won and conquered from the Irish. For the scopes of land, which were granted to the first adventurers, were too large; and the liberties and royalties, which they obtained therein, were too great for subjects.” He specifies the grants to Strongbow, Robert Fitz-Stephen, Miles Cogan, Philip le Bruce, Hugh de Lacy, John de Courcy, William Burke Fitz-Adeln, Thomas de Clare, Otho de Grandison, and Robert le Poer; and adds, “thus was all Ireland cantonized among ten persons of the English nation; and though they had not gained the possession of one-third part of the whole kingdom, yet in title they were owners and lords of all, so as nothing was left to be granted to the natives.”

The effects of this “error” were most perceptibly felt in the reign of Henry the Third :

“All writers,” continues Davis, “do impute the decay and loss of Leinster to the absence of the English Lords, who married the five daughters of William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke (to whom that great seignory descended), when his five sons, who inherited the same successively, and, during their times, held the same in peace and obedience to the law of England, were all dead, without issue, which happened about



the fortieth year of King Henry the Third : for the eldest being married to Hugh Bigot, Earl of Norfolk, who, in right of his wife, had the Marshalship of England ; the second to Warren de Mountchensey, whose sole daughter and heir was matched to William de Valentia, half brother to King Henry the Third, who by that match was made Earl of Pembroke ; the third to Gilbert de Clare, Earl of Gloucester ; the fourth to William de Ferrers, Earl of Darby ; the fifth to William de Bruce, Lord of Brecknock : These great lords, having greater inheritances, in their own right, in England, than they had in Ireland, in right of their wives, (and yet each of the co-partners had an entire county allotted for her purparty, as is before declared), could not be drawn to make their personal residence in this kingdom, but managed their estates here by their seneschals and servants. . . . . And again, the decay and loss of Ulster and Connaught is attributed to this ; that the Lord William Burke, the last Earl of that name, died without issue male ; whose ancestors, namely, the Red Earl, and Sir Hugh de Lacy before him, being personally resident, held up their greatness there, and kept the English in peace and the Irish in awe ; but when those provinces descended upon an heir female and an infant, the Irish overran Ulster, and the younger branches of the Burkes usurped Connaught. And, therefore, the ordinance made in England, the third of Richard the Second, against such as were absent from their lands in Ireland, and gave two-third parts of the profits thereof unto the king, until they returned, or placed a sufficient number of men to defend the same, was grounded upon good reason of state : which ordinance was put in execution for many years after, as appeareth by sundry seizures made thereupon in the time of King Richard the Second, Henry IV., Henry V., and Henry VI., whereof there remain records in the Remembrancer's office here. Among the rest, the Duke of Norfolk himself was not spared ; but was impleaded upon this ordinance for two parts of the profits of Dorbury's Island, and other lands in the county of Wexford, in the time of Henry VI. And afterwards, upon the same reason of state, all the lands of the House of Norfolk, of the Earl of Shrewsbury, the Lord Berkeley, and others, who, having lands in Ireland, kept their continual residence in England, were entirely resumed by the act of absentees, made in the twenty-eighth year of Henry VIII."

The policy adopted with regard to the "first adventurers," influenced the English government, whenever there was an opportunity, in all subsequent times. Upon the accession of Edward the Sixth, the territories of O'Moor, Prince of Leix (King's county), and O'Connor, Prince of Offaly (Queen's county), were seized, and distributed according to pristine usage. In Elizabeth's time, the same occurred, but on a far more extended scale. One or two samples of the pretexts, on which "scopes of land," forming no inconsiderable portion of the entire island, were thus disposed of, are worth mentioning. Con O'Neill, to whom the principality of Ulster belonged, had two sons,—Shane, who was legitimate, and Matthew, who was born out of wedlock.

A contention arose between the sons, on the death of the chieftain, as to the right of successorship. The English government interfered, and ruled the point in favour of Matthew, "practising," says Parnell (*Apology*, p. 58), "a policy that has governed them in the latest times in India, where it has been the custom to raise to the throne, in violation of the customary mode of succession, a person who depended for his station on their power, who was strictly a dependent, and who might be set aside whenever a favourable opportunity occurred." Matthew was proclaimed the lawful heir. The consequence was a rebellion on the part of Shane—a declaration of war against him—a conquering of his forces—and the confiscation of the whole possessions, both of Shane and Matthew. "In order," adds Mr. Parnell, "to divert Shane, the territory was reputed Matthew's; and in order to get rid of Matthew's claim, the territory was confiscated as Shane's." M'Mahon, Prince of Monaghan, surrendered his country to Elizabeth, and received a grant of it, with remainder, in default of issue, to his brother Hugh. He died without offspring, and Hugh took possession. "The Lord Deputy, Fitzwilliam, proceeded to Monaghan, under pretence of giving M'Mahon security in his possession. But as soon as he arrived there, he raised an accusation against M'Mahon, for having, two years before, recovered some rent due to him, by force of arms. This, by the law of the English pale, was treason; but M'Mahon had never stipulated to be subject to the English law: on the contrary, the patents by which their territories were regranted to the Irish princes, either formally acknowledged the validity of the Irish Brehon law, or tolerated it by a silence equally expressive. The unhappy M'Mahon, for an offence committed, before the law, which declared it capital, was established in his country, was tried, condemned by a jury formed of private soldiers, and executed in two days, to the horror and consternation of his subjects, and the rest of the Irish chieftains. His territory was distributed to Sir H. Bagnall, and other English adventurers. Four only of the sept saved their property." The present Marquis of Bath, and Mr. Shirley, are, we believe, descendants of these adventurers. Mr. Shirley holds 33,000 acres, according to Wakefield; and the estates of the noble Marquis are, we learn, equally extensive. The Marquis of Bath, we have heard, was never in Ireland; and Mr. Shirley, for a short time only, on one or two electioneering occasions. The estates of both had, in Mr. Wakefield's time, the true characteristics of absentee property: they exhibited (v. i. p. 269.) "wretched cultivation, fields without hedge-rows, and inclosed only by earthen banks or dykes; land running to waste, which, with great truth, may be compared

to its inhabitants,—that is, losing its strength for want of proper nourishment, and existing in a state of the utmost poverty.”

The confiscations of the reign of James the First, did much to extend absenteeism, though some of the natives were then, for the first time, included in the list of the new proprietors. The possessions of the London companies alone, extend to the fee-simple of nearly an entire county. The confiscations of Charles the Second's and William the Third's reign, bestowed their Irish estates upon the ancestors of a number of persons now amongst the permanent absentees. And here may be noted the consequences, to the natives of Ireland, of their “loyalty.” They were true to their legitimate sovereign, Charles the First, and the penalty was, confiscations to the amount of nearly two-thirds of the whole island. They were true to their legitimate sovereign, James the Second, and the penalty was, confiscations to the amount of a twelfth of the whole island. The Restoration, which the authors of the Protestant Liturgy have not scrupled to call “blessed,” was a triumph to their principles. Yet it brought nothing to them but the injuries and insults of a confirmed proscription. The circumstance, that Ireland is a country, subordinate to one more opulent and improved, would in itself be a source of considerable absenteeism, if no other cause operated. “The people,” says Adam Smith, “who possess the most extensive property in the dependent, will generally chuse to live in the governing, country.”

We have already referred, in the words of Sir John Davis, to some of the legislative expedients, which were adopted in several reigns, up to the 28th of Henry the Eighth, for the repression of absenteeism. An act, passed in the 10th of Charles the First, declares, that “the King and his progenitors, out of their princely wisdom, had thought proper to confer upon several able, worthy, and well-deserving persons, inhabitants dwelling in England, and elsewhere out of the kingdom of Ireland, titles of honour, whereby they do enjoy place and precedency, according to their titles respectively; so that it cannot be denied but that, in a just way of retribution, they ought to contribute to all public charges and payments, taxed by Parliament in that kingdom from whence the titles of their honours are derived, and whereunto others of their rank there resident are liable.” It is therefore enacted, that—

“All and every person or persons, now being, or which shall hereafter be, an Earl, Viscount, or Baron of that kingdom, and have place and voice in the Parliament of that realm, though resident or dwelling in England, or elsewhere, shall be liable to all public payments and charges, which shall be taxed and assessed in this or any other Par-

liament, and shall, from time to time, contribute thereunto, and pay their rateable parts thereof, in such manner and form as others of their rank are liable unto, or shall pay."

There is evidence even of the operation of a principle of "*appropriation*," in reference to this evil, in ancient times. We find that a statute, (the 36th of Henry the Sixth, c. 1) reciting, that "divers persons, advanced to benefices within the land of Ireland, do absent them out of the said land in other lands, whereby the issues and profits of their said benefices be yearly taken forth of the said land of Ireland, to the great impoverishment and weakening of the same, diminishing of God's service, and withdrawing of hospitality," enacts, that—

"All manner benefices within the said land, of whatsoever condition that they be, shall keep residence continually, in their proper persons, in the said land within twelve months, after the said Parliament finished, and otherwise, the issues and profits of the said benefices (divine service and ordinary charges kept) shall be divided, the half to the commodity and profit of their benefices and churches, the other half to be expended *in our sovereign lord the King's wars, in defence of this poor land of Ireland*,—and any grants of absency made by the King to them, or any of them, or to be made and granted in time coming, to the contrary hereof, to be void, and of no force in law, unless that it be by authority of Parliament."

In 1715, an act was passed, whereby persons who had any salaries, profits of employments, fees, or pensions, in Ireland, should pay unto his Majesty, four shillings out of every twenty shillings yearly, which they were entitled unto, unless such persons should reside within the kingdom for six months in every year. The tax, thus imposed, was to be deducted yearly out of the several salaries, profits, and fees, by the persons who paid the same; the whole was to be then paid over to the vice-treasurers, to be accounted for to his Majesty; and the deputies of the parties were to give in, on oath, an account of the net profit of the employments, on pain of being incapacitated to execute such deputation in future, and of forfeiting one hundred pounds. The Secretary to the Commissioners of the Revenue, the agents of regiments, and agents of persons entitled to receive salaries or pensions, were, on pain of being disabled to hold their respective offices, to deliver in, on oath, a list of the officers of the revenue, of the officers of regiments above the degree of a field officer, and of the persons entitled to receive salaries or pensions, who should be out of the kingdom for six months. There was a saving for the Lord Lieutenant, Chief Secretary, and such persons as should be exempted by his Majesty's sign manual; as also for officers of regiments ordered abroad, half-pay officers,

widows of officers, and officers under the degree of a field officer. This tax was continued by several acts, until 1753, when, it appearing that the crown exercised the dispensing power, in instances so numerous as to render the tax nugatory, it was suffered to expire.

In 1773, Mr. Flood, then a member of the government, endeavoured to carry a more general measure, one affecting all descriptions of income, rents, profits, &c., upon which he proposed to impose a tax of two shillings in the pound. The proposition had, in the beginning, the declared support of the then Lord Lieutenant (Earl Harcourt); but that nobleman's countenance was afterwards withdrawn, in consequence, it was suspected, of private remonstrances from England. In the House of Commons, it had to encounter a two-fold hostility—opposition proceeding from the friends and retainers of five great Lords, upon whom the tax would press most heavily, and opposition proceeding from disinterested men, who feared that, as the project was one introduced by a member of the government, it was only a prelude to a land tax, or some other measure, which, in their estimation, would be equally burdensome and pernicious in its general effects. Mr. Flood combated the arguments of the latter class of his opponents, by contending, that they rested upon no principle more fair or rational, than that which governs those, who think it safe to be always incredulous, when anything *good* is offered to their belief. "Their objection," said he, "amounts to this—that the favour of having such a law is too great to be expected, without some evil design in those who propose it. Whatever weight is to be attached to their conjectures, as to ulterior objects, they are, at all events, compelled to admit, that there *is* something beneficial in what is recommended; and thus, from the terms of their own arguments, do we draw matter commendatory of the measure which they assail. I would entreat these gentlemen, if they really see anything good in the proposed law, to suffer the country to have its benefits, and wait until time enables them to form a less erroneous judgment of those remote contingencies, with which they perplex their imaginations, than they can possibly do at present. The government may have sinister motives for what they propose; but if we are resolved *never* to receive any benefit from government, lest it should be introductive of injury, then we must sit down, contented to receive nothing but evil from it." The five "great Lords" alluded to, were the Duke of Devonshire, the Marquis of Rockingham, Lord Besborough, Lord Milton, and Lord Upper Ossory. In reference to the partizans of these individuals, Mr. Flood said—"I am amazed that gentlemen can be so incon-

siderate as to agree to tax three millions of the useful and industrious natives of Ireland, rather than *five great men, who are its bane.*" Addressing himself, again, to the ungrounded prejudices and apprehensions of the more numerous and powerful party, who acted from a suspicion that the ministry were governed by sinister views, he proceeded:—"The whole rents of Ireland do not exceed four millions, of which upwards of six hundred thousand pounds are drawn hence, every year, by absentee landlords. In what can all this be supposed to end, but absolute ruin? I call upon gentlemen to consider this. I call upon them, in the name of the genius of their almost exhausted country; I call upon them in the name of Truth, that awful Deity to whom I devote what now I say, to reflect on the weakness, the absurdity, and the awful consequences of opposing an act, which we ever wished for, when not in our power to obtain, and now, through an unjust and ill-timed suspicion, reject when it is in our power." Mr. Flood's efforts were unavailing, but not signally so; for, on a division, there was a majority of only 122 to 102.

At the distance of ten years, Mr. Molyneux again agitated the long-debated subject, with results, however, much more disheartening; for his proposition was negatived by a majority of 172. The last time the question was debated, in the Irish Parliament, was on the eve of the rebellion. Government wanted to raise a sum of £150,000, and Mr. Vandeleur recommended that it should be levied upon absentee estates. There was no discussion as to principle. It was not contended, in any quarter, that there would be anything unjust or inequitable in making those, who "draw over the profits raised in Ireland, refunding nothing," contribute a little to the defence and protection, at least, of their own possessions. But the necessity for the money was pressing. It was wanted directly, and, as an absentee tax would not be available until the end of a year, the proposition of Mr. Vandeleur was rejected, but on this ground only.

We have thus given a sketch of the legislative efforts, made in the Irish Parliament, from the most remote times to the eve of its extinction, to remedy the evil of absenteeism. "We cannot," said Adam Smith, "wonder that the proposal of an absentee tax should be so very popular in Ireland." That it was always popular is abundantly evident; but that it should have been so, on the ground of the practical mischiefs resulting from absenteeism, is a point which remains to be investigated.

We need not inform our readers, that, in recent times, the opinion has been pertinaciously maintained, that absenteeism does no mischief to any country. Mr. M'Culloch is the most conspicuous advocate of this new doctrine. Before the Commit-

tee, appointed in 1825 to investigate the state of Ireland, he broadly asserted, that the Irish proprietor, resident in London or Paris, was in as good a position to encourage the industry of his country, as if he fixed his abode in Dublin or Cork. He delivered himself to the same effect, without modification, before the Committee of 1830, though, on the subject of Poor Laws, he admitted that his mind had undergone a considerable change. He is supposed to be the author of an article in the *Edinburgh Review*, in which his dogmas on the subject are elaborately defended. This article comprises all that is to be said on his side of the question, and we shall, therefore, examine it with some minuteness.

The reviewer notices, that the absentee remittances are usually estimated at three and a half millions. He thinks they do not amount to so much, though many well-informed persons suppose them to be, at least, half a million more; but assuming the estimate to be accurate, he says :

“ The primary question is—how are these rents remitted to them ? Now as there is very little specie in Ireland, and as Irish bank notes do not circulate in England, it is obvious that they can be remitted in one way only, and that is, by sending abroad an equivalent amount of the *raw produce*, or *manufactures* of the country. Were all the absentees to return to Ireland, there would, no doubt, be an increased demand for commodities, or labour, or both, in the home market, to the extent of three or three and a half millions ; but it is undeniably certain, that *this increase* of demand in the *home* market would be balanced by a precisely equal *diminution* of demand in the *foreign* market ; and unless it can be shown that foreign merchants trade for smaller profits than the home merchants, we must be satisfied, on the first blush of the matter, that the expenditure of those landlords who reside in London or Paris, it is no matter which, has just as great an effect in *vivifying* and *animating* industry in Ireland, as if they resided in Dublin or Cork.”

The “ primary question ” is easily answered. The rents are remitted in cash, to obtain which there are more facilities than the reviewer imagines. There is no deficiency even of specie ; on the contrary, it is redundant, and, therefore, the Bank of Ireland finds it necessary to make periodical shipments of it to Liverpool.

If “ Irish notes do not circulate in England,” a bank order, or English notes, can be obtained at a small cost in Dublin. The process of the payment of absentee rents is just this : the small dealers send their commodities to the next fair, or market, where they are bought *for cash* by larger dealers, who, by themselves or their factors, are the ultimate exporters. The *cash* is handed to the agent on the gale day, in notes and specie. For these he

gets an order on Dublin at a branch bank, or he himself is the bearer of his gathering to the metropolis. He knows nothing of the "equivalent sent abroad in raw produce or manufactures;" he sees, and is concerned with nothing but *money*. That is, undoubtedly, the representative of the produce sent "abroad." But the question offering itself to our consideration is, what the non-residence of the individual, to whom the money is to be transmitted, has to do with the sending abroad of the produce? The proposition of the reviewer is nothing less, than that there would be no shipment of the produce if the proprietor were at home. This will easily be tested, if we suppose that the money is, in the first instance, paid to the proprietor himself, living in the midst of his tenantry. In that case, would there be no shipment? Undoubtedly there would, and the same shipment, in manner and form, that would take place, if the proprietor were permanently settled in London or Paris.

The reviewer proceeds—

"The agent of an absentee landlord, after receiving the rents of his tenants, say £10,000, purchases a bill of exchange for this £10,000 from an Irish merchant. But the merchant, in order to supply his correspondent in London, Liverpool, or Amsterdam, on whom the bill is drawn, with funds to pay it, *must*, for it is not in any respect optional with him, go into the Irish market, and buy £10,000 worth of the raw products or manufactured goods of the country, and send them abroad to his correspondent. Where, then, (he asks) is the difference to Ireland, in so far as the demand for commodities is concerned, whether the landlord is or is not resident? When he is resident he will receive £10,000 from his tenants, and he will go to market and buy an equal amount of *Irish corn, beef, hats, shoes, &c.*; and when he is not resident, a merchant gets the £10,000, and lays out every sixpence of them in the purchase of Irish commodities, *just as the landlord did when he was at home*. Turn it and twist it as you please, you will find, on analysing any case that can possibly be presented, that this is *the whole* difference, in so far as expenditure is concerned, between a resident and a non-resident landlord. The one exchanges his revenue for Irish commodities, which he imports into his house in Dublin, and consumes there; the other, also, through the merchant who furnishes him with bills, exchanges his for Irish commodities, which, or the equivalents for which, he imports into, and consumes, in his house in London or Paris; and therefore, unless it can be proved that the mere local act of consumption is advantageous, we must acknowledge, that the consumption of that portion of the annual revenue of a nation, which is sent abroad to absentees, contributes as much to the general advantage as the consumption of any other portion of income. It is never, in short, by sending abroad *revenue*, but by sending abroad the *capital*, by whose agency revenue is produced, that nations are impoverished and ruined."

If what is assumed here were true, the case would be proved



If the agent were to purchase, with the £10,000, the corn, beef, hats, shoes, &c. "just as the landlord did when he was at home," there would be no reason to complain, on the score, at least, of employment. But, as far as the individual is concerned, the agent purchases little of corn and beef, and no hats or shoes at all. There is some exportation of corn and beef. Let the reviewer, if it please him, imagine that it is materially influenced by the existence of absentee establishments in England. But hats and shoes are not articles of Irish exportation. They can be manufactured in Ireland, and would, no doubt, be used by the absentee, if he became a resident. He, of course, prefers to go to the next shop or market. This is in his own immediate neighbourhood. It is supplied, not with Irish, but English goods, and in this lies the grievance to Ireland of Absenteeism.—The reviewer speaks of the "mere act of local consumption," as if its benefits were to be questioned. There can be no doubt at all of its advantages. It is far from being the same to the hands employed at Carton,\* whether the produce be consumed in Kildare or London. There is no menial of a great man who does not dislike to be left behind upon board wages. The reviewer continues—

"Let it be supposed, which however is most certainly not the case, that the exports from Ireland are *not* augmented in consequence of remittances on account of absentees; it is, on this hypothesis, clear to demonstration, that the *imports*, that would otherwise take place, of English and foreign produce into Ireland, must be diminished by the whole amount of the bills drawn in favour of the absentees; for, it would follow, were this not the case, that they must now be subsisted either on charity or on the air! If then the absentees were to return home, and the same amount of Irish produce to continue to be exported, all the English and foreign commodities, on which the absentees had subsisted when abroad, would henceforth be *imported* into Ireland; and there could not, under such circumstances, be any increased demand, in consequence of their return, for the smallest additional quantity of Irish produce."

The English and foreign commodities, on which the absentee proprietor had subsisted when abroad, would *not* be imported into Ireland in the way, or to the extent, which is supposed. Foreign commodities he certainly would have, but they would pass to him through twenty Irish, instead of English hands. He would find it necessary or useful to purchase English commodities, but they would not, in number or value, amount to any thing in comparison with what he would use, if he were resident in England. Hats, shoes, and an endless variety of articles, would be taken by the employer or his dependents, from Irish artizans. Whatever a proprietor's prepossessions might be,

---

\* The seat of the Duke of Leinster, near Dublin.

he could not, on every occasion, send for an English labourer, painter, glazier, smith, or carpenter. But the reviewer asks—

“Suppose the rental of Lord Hertford’s Irish property to amount to £100,000 a year, is it not a matter of consummate indifference to Ireland whether his Lordship consumes annually £100,000 worth of Irish commodities in his seat in Ireland, or has an *equivalent amount* of them sent to a London merchant on his account?”

In a mercantile view of the question it might be matter of “consummate indifference,” if his lordship *did* actually consume £100,000 worth of Irish commodities: but how is it certain that he consumes even £10,000 worth, or one pennyworth in the year? If the payment were in *kind*, there would be no doubt about the matter; but it is not in kind, it is in money; and how can we be certain, we ask, when the noble marquis has his rents in money, that one shilling of them is expended in the purchase of Irish commodities? The reviewer assumes that they must be expended in the purchase of Irish commodities, and for no better reason, than that the rents come out of the commodities, and the commodities are sold in England. Is it because Lord Hertford lives in London, or elsewhere out of Ireland, that the Irish commodities are sold in England? Do the manufacturers in Lancashire buy Irish beef and pork, that his lordship may have his rents? Would they not buy Irish beef and pork if no such individual ever existed? Why do the Irish buy English commodities, French commodities, Chinese commodities? Is it because there are absentees to be helped to their rents in Dublin, Cork, or Limerick?

There seems a strange contradiction in an argument, used by the reviewer, to prove, that absentee remittances, and a tribute to a foreign power, are not similar in their effects. He says, the absentee must return to Ireland if his remittances cease; but, if the tribute were to cease, there would be no one to return, and “there would, in consequence, be so much additional wealth left in the country.” The money that ceases to be sent to a foreign power is so much additional wealth left in the pockets of the people. When the power has it, the people suffer; when it is left amongst them, it is “so much wealth in their pockets.” But when the absentee is the party, to whom it is to be remitted, the case is quite different! If the absentee be not a foreign power, he may be in a foreign country. This very Lord Hertford spends most of his time in Rome or Naples. What difference does it make to his Irish tenants whether their money goes into his pockets, or those of the Pope, or of the King of the two

Sicilies! The three parties, Lord Hertford being beyond the Alps, would appear to be equal consumers of Irish commodities.

"Suppose 1,000 quarters of wheat are exported from Ireland to Liverpool, on account of an absentee; if this absentee returns home, this exportation will of course cease—but what will Ireland gain by its cessation?"

We have had occasion already to quote this passage.\* We have only to repeat, that no wheat is exported to Liverpool "on account of an absentee;" and that, therefore, the exportation would not cease on his return home. Lord Cloncurry, since he became a Peer of Parliament, spends half the year in London, and half of it in the neighbourhood of Dublin. A thousand quarters of wheat, grown on his estates, are, most probably, shipped to Liverpool during his absence; and, out of the produce, rent is paid to his steward. But the same operation takes place when he is at home. Presence or absence does not affect the shipment of the wheat; but the case is different as to the spending of the greater portion of the money which it yields. During absence, London has its advantages,—during presence, the possession is transferred to Dublin.

The reviewer admits, that the notions which prevail with respect to the injurious effects of absentee expenditure, appear, on a superficial view, natural and well founded. He says—

"When a wealthy landlord resides on his estate, there is generally, in some contiguous village, a number of little tradesmen and manufacturers who work on his account, but who, it is alleged, will be thrown altogether out of employment, and left entirely destitute, in the event of his removing to another country. This opinion, however, is founded entirely on a misapprehension of the nature of profits. Those who raise an outcry against absenteeism, take for granted that all retail dealers, tradesmen, and manufacturers, live at the expense of those who employ them, or who buy their products. It is certain, however, that they do no such thing—that they live by means of their own capital and industry, and that these would support them, *though their customers were annihilated.*"

It must be admitted that there is some novelty in this doctrine. A shoemaker, it seems, can live though he has no customers to buy his shoes! It is, to be sure, subsequently explained, that a man, who cannot earn his bread by manufacturing shoes, may employ his capital and industry in "*some other way.*" He is at liberty, no doubt, to turn from shoe-making to digging; but, at his new avocation, he is not in his natural or most advantageous position; and he may (and he surely would, in Ireland) find such

---

\* Dublin Review, July 1836, p. 291.

a superabundance of competitors, as would place him in danger again of suffering the hardship which overtook him when his "customers were annihilated." We would save him from such a calamity, by leaving him, with the aid of a resident gentry, at shoe-making. We have twice too many delvers, as it is; and we can do no service to society by diminishing the number of our artizans.

The reviewer concedes, that "Bath and London are benefitted, though in a very small degree, by the residence of Irish absentees;" but he denies that "Ireland loses what they gain, or that she, in fact, loses anything by their non-residence." What are the benefits conferred on London or Bath? They are indicated in another sentence, in which the writer alludes to an English shop, or an order given to an English tradesman. But are there no shops or tradesmen in our own Irish towns? Lord Cloncurry, when not an absentee, buys very good mercery in Dame-street, and capital boots in another part of Dublin. The material, in both instances, most probably comes from England; but the mercer is assisted, by His Lordship's custom, in paying his shopmen and servants, and maintaining his family. The reviewer might find some person inclined to adopt his theory on this head, if he employed a little ingenious sophistry, to show that London and Bath are *not* gainers by Irish absentees. But when he admits the gain to the shopkeepers and tradesmen of those places, he necessarily declares the suffering to the shopkeepers and tradesmen of Dublin.

"Suppose that an Irish gentleman, resident in Dublin, pays an account of £300 or £400 a-year to his coach and harness-makers.—If this gentleman comes to London, he will have a similar account to pay to the coach and harness-makers of that city. But then, it must be kept in view, that the £300 or £400 that were, in the first instance, paid to the coach and harness-makers of Dublin, must now be paid to the linen manufacturers of Ireland, or to the producers of those articles that suit the English market. And they must assuredly have rather antiquated notions of national advantage, who presume to contend that it is as much for the interest of Ireland to employ her capital and labour in the production of articles in which England has a decided advantage over her, as it is to employ them in the production of those in which she has a decided advantage over England! A century ago, an argument, if we may so miscall it, of this sort, might have worn an imposing aspect.—But we should have thought, had not their late outcry convinced us of the contrary, that even the Dublin patriots and paragraph writers would have been inclined to listen to it at present with some misgivings."

The point urged here is remarkably favourable to the development of the errors of the reviewer's whole theory on this

subject. There is nothing in it of the entanglement which seems, on a hasty view, to connect itself with the proposition regarding the 1000 quarters of corn sent to Liverpool "on account of the absentee." Here there is brought distinctly under contemplation a considerable amount of *money* paid annually to a Dublin tradesman. To arrive at a just conclusion on the entire question, we have only to see what is to happen with regard to this money, if a resident proprietor become non-resident. It is first payable to a Dublin coach and harness-maker. When non-residence takes place, does it remain with the Dublin coach and harness-maker? No, says the reviewer himself. And to whom does it go? He answers, as he should, to the coach and harness-maker of London. Then, there is a clear loss of £300 or £400 a-year under this head, and how is it counterbalanced? By the purchase of *Irish linen*, quoth the reviewer. No, we reply; it cannot be counterbalanced in this way; for the proprietor will have no occasion for £300 or £400 worth of linen, in a year, and any consumption of linen, that takes place in his family, is not a gain to Ireland by the accident of his non-residence. Whatever quantity of Irish linen, or of any other Irish produce, he could by possibility buy in London, he was in the habit, while a resident, of buying in Dublin or some other Irish town. Therefore, there cannot be a gain to the country under the head of "linen and other Irish produce," and there is an admitted loss, in the item of the payments to the London coach and harness-maker.

We need not pursue the subject further. The true doctrine regarding absenteeism is, obviously, that it is, *pro tanto*, a loss to a country, and cannot, in the nature of things, be otherwise. When a community is rich, and when the number of its non-residents is comparatively small, absenteeism cannot be an evil of great magnitude. In England, it is a scarcely perceptible mischief; but England and Ireland are widely different, not only in general wealth, but also in the proportion which the rental bears to the value of the produce of the soil. A tract of land, which yields to the proprietor in Ireland £2 or £2. 10s. an acre, would yield to the proprietor, if it were in England, only £1. If the case were different, absentee remittances would not be so formidable a drain. There is this consideration, too, that England has advantages from the expenditure of the public revenue, which Ireland does not possess. Whatever is drawn from her people is spent amongst them. It is otherwise in Ireland, for her revenue exceeds her expenditure; by, at least, a fourth, and that fourth is remitted to the English Treasury. We are fully aware that the case of Scotland is one of greater apparent hardship in this regard. But the rental of Scotland is low, in comparison

with that of Ireland, and the state of the Scotch revenue proves, that she has capabilities, at least, *four* times greater than the Irish.

It remains for us to give some *data*, on which the reader may arrive at a conjecture, as to the probable amount of the absentee remittances.

This is a subject which interested the Irish, when they had a resident Parliament. We find that, so early as 1691, a "List of Absentees" was published, in a work entitled "Remarks on Affairs of Trade of England and Ireland." Three classes of non-residents were set down in this compilation. 1st. Persons living wholly, or for the most part, in England. 2dly. Persons resident in England, "who received pensions out of the revenue of Ireland in 1686 and since." And 3dly, "Students at the Universities, travellers, attendants and expectants at Court," &c. The remittances to all were, at this period, estimated at only £136,018 a-year.

The next list was published in 1729. The patriotic and excellent Thomas Prior is alleged to have been the author. His "general abstract of the quantity of money drawn out of the kingdom yearly" is the following:—

By those of the first class (altogether absentees)	-	£204,200
By those of the second class (living generally abroad)	-	91,800
By those of the third class (occasionally absent)	-	54,000
By those whose income is under £400 per annum	-	40,000
By those who have employments in Ireland	-	31,510
For the education of youth, law-suits, attendance for employments, and by dealers	-	33,000
By the pensioners on the Civil List	-	23,070
By those on the Military Establishment	-	67,658
By French pensioners	-	2,560
By remittances to Gibraltar	-	30,000
By adventures to America	-	30,000
On account of several articles (ensurance of ships, &c. &c.)	-	20,000
		<hr/> £627,798

The next list was published in 1767<sup>d</sup>. It raised the remittances, supposed to have been ascertained, to £869,382, adding £200,000 for reasons stated as follows:—

1st. We are to observe that a great many estates and woods have, of late, been sold in Ireland, and all the purchase money at once carried to England; and, which is farther remarkable, some estates have, in the compass of a few years, been sold again, and all the purchase money sent away a second time.

2d. That great sums of money are yearly sent abroad, to discharge old debts contracted by persons now residing in Ireland.

3d. That, though some of the aforesaid persons may spend less abroad than here rated, yet many of them spend more than their yearly income, which debts must be paid in England after they come to reside in Ireland.

4th. That several estates of Irish landlords, who live abroad, have, of late, been much raised, and large fines taken, and remitted to them, and many more estates will not fail to be raised to the height, as the old leases expire, and thereby encrease their yearly draughts upon us.

5th. That several persons, who live abroad, have large mortgages on estates in Ireland; the interest money whereof is constantly returned to them in England.

6th. Many of our young lords and gentlemen, in a few years after they come of age, squander, in other countries, all the ready money which had been saved for them by their guardians in their minorities.

7th. Great numbers live abroad, whose names and estates, for want of due information, are here omitted.

8th. There is yearly carried out of this kingdom £150,000 by the colliers of England and Scotland, who take very little else but ready money, in return for their coals.

On these grounds, the author added £200,000, being in doubt whether he should not make it £300,000; and the total of remittances, according to him, were in that year £1,069,382.

In 1779, Mr. Arthur Young, in the Appendix to his Tour in Ireland, compiled a list of absentees, whose receipts he estimated to be £732,200 annually. But the most perfect account seems to be an alphabetical one, which was published in 1782, and which gave a total of £2,223,222, including, however, a sum of £500,000, being the amount of the expenditure on coals and "other articles." According to this estimate, the rental of the large proprietors, in 1782, was £1,227,480.

The next evidence we have to produce, is that of Mr. Puget, delivered before the Exchange Committee, in 1804, and alluded to already.\* According to this authority (and none could be higher), the remittances to the great proprietors, at that period, reached to £2,000,000; but we had better give his words:

"I should suppose, that the money paid to absentees was about £2,000,000, in the year 1803; and I form my calculation from having examined what passed through my hands, directly and indirectly, from the 1st of January, 1803, to the 31st of December, 1803, and the amount was between 8 and £900,000; but it will be unfair to presume, that that sum will continue to be so large, as much of it, for [from] the circumstances of the times, was sent over to be invested in the funds. The grounds I took, respecting the calculation of £2,000,000, were these, that, independent of my private correspondence, I could calculate what part of the Treasury drafts, drawn on me, were for absentee accounts.

---

\* Dublin Review, July 1836, p. 287.

"Do you consider, that £2,000,000 is a greater or less sum, than has been annually remitted to absentees, for the last four years?"

"Greater, though not considerably; but considerably greater than before the rebellion."—*Report of May and June, 1804, ordered to be reprinted May 26, 1826.*

At the period alluded to by Mr. Puget, the effects of the Union, in making England more completely a "governing country" (to use the words of Adam Smith), and giving her, by that means, additional powers of drawing away "the people who possess the most extensive property," could scarcely have been perceptible. Since 1804, a good deal is to be set down for increase of rental. Coals were, as we have seen, referred to, in former times, as a measure of the drain from Ireland. The consumption of them has more than doubled since 1804.\* The charges, on account of mortgages, have, no doubt, largely increased. Inter-course with England is increasing every year. In 1831, 11,429 persons passed from Ireland, as cabin passengers in the steam packets, many of them accompanied by carriages and horses. To assume that their expenditure amounted to half a million, is to adopt a small estimate. On all these grounds, it may be fairly concluded, that those witnesses, before recent Parliamentary committees, who regard the present absentee drain as amounting, in one way or another, to £3,500,000, are rather under the mark than over it.†

An entirely new drain has opened in latter years—that of the public revenue. The actual expenditure of revenue in Ireland (which is a diminishing one‡), may be set down at £3,160,000.

\* In 1801, 315,344 tons of coals were imported into Ireland; in 1825, the amount imported was 738,453.—*Report on the State of Ireland, ordered to be printed July 16, 1830.*

† Mr. Butler Bryan's estimate, as we have already had occasion to notice, is £3,000,000; Mr. Ensor's, £4,000,000; and Mr. M'Culloch's, £3,500,000. The evidence of Mr. Ensor, before the Committee of 1830, on the State of the Irish Poor, is the following:—

"Can you tell the Committee, what proportion of the rental of Ireland is supposed to be spent in other countries?"

"I have made a calculation of that rather particularly, and I should suppose about £4,000,000.

"What proportion do you suppose that to be to the whole?"

"Probably a-third or more.

"On what grounds did you form your calculation of the amount of the Irish income spent out of Ireland?"

"By putting down the names of absentees, and their rental, not throughout the whole country, but in some counties. I took two counties, on the credit of the Bishop of Limerick; and, in two counties, he said, there was nearly half a million; these were Kerry and Limerick—£300,000 in Limerick, and £150,000 in Kerry."—*Third Report*, p. 481.

‡ The payments to the army serving in Ireland, reached to 3 and sometimes to £4,000,000 during the war. They do not amount at present to £1,000,000.



The payments for debt, army, and other services, were, in 1833, according to a Parliamentary return, £2,910,808.\* A portion of this was only apparent expenditure in Ireland, as considerable sums were paid out of it to absentee pensioners, public officers, and others, whose incomes were chargeable on the Irish revenue, as well as to the account of clothing and accoutrements purchased in England for the use of the army serving in Ireland. If we deduct £150,000 for these sums, we shall reduce the amount to £2,760,000; to which, however, we must add payments to Chelsea and other military pensioners, made out of the British revenue, which will thus raise it to a total of £3,160,000. The payments into the Exchequer, in the same year, were, according to the Finance Accounts, £3,534,940. To these we are to add £789,000, as "*uncredited revenue*."† Both sums make £4,323,940, and exceed the actual expenditure by £1,163,940. We speak of 1833, for we have no later return of expenditure. The case is, at present, still more unfavourable to Ireland; for, not only has the expenditure since diminished, but the revenue has increased. It would be far from exaggeration; to assume the present excess of income over expenditure to be £1,500,000; and as the absentee rents amount to £3,500,000, we shall thus have altogether a drain of *five millions* a-year, and this counterbalanced only by an excess of the value of exports over imports, which, at the date of the last returns, did not amount, in the whole, to more than £647,000.‡ *This, we repeat, is a growing evil.* Can it be much longer endured? Has it not claims of undeniable urgency on the earliest attention of Parliament?

ART. X.—1. *A History of British Fishes.* By William Yarrell, V.P.Z.S., F.L.S. Illustrated by nearly 400 wood-cuts. 2 vols. 8vo. London. 1836.

2. *An Angler's Rambles.* By Edward Jesse, Esq., F.L.S. Author of "*Gleanings in Natural History*." 8vo. London. 1836.

THE reading public—and what portion of the public is now unworthy of the epithet?—have great reason to be thankful to the author of any work calculated to tempt them forth to the field or the flood, to make them observant of the miracles of

\* See last Dublin Review, p. 305.

† Ibid, p. 295.

‡ In 1825, the value of Irish exports to all parts was £9,243,000, and of imports from all parts £8,596,000.—*Appendix to the Report on the State of the Irish Poor, ordered to be printed July 16, 1830.*

creation, and to instruct and delight them with its beauties as seen on the land, and its wonders as displayed in the phenomena and productions of the mighty deep. There is a spirit of life, and health, and improvement in the contemplation of nature under the direction of a sure guide. It encreases our value to ourselves, and to those who are about us; for it lengthens the number of our days, and encreases the length of each day, by the efficiency of whatever we are called upon to do.

Whatever may be the character of that portion of nature which we visit, it is still fraught with this delightful power of imparting to us, not only the elements of thought, but the capacity of thinking. The mountain top, high above all vegetation except the last lichen, is gloriously sublime in its mists, its eagles, its towering pinnacles, and its stupendous precipices. The dry moor, and the elevated down, whose chief covering is the purple heath, is sure to sprinkle in a due admixture of wild berries,—for the enjoyment of which the birds make the wild ring with their songs of gratitude; while the countless bees, uniting their mellow hum, in the season of the heath bloom, proclaim to us, that if this is not a land “flowing with milk,” it is, at least, a land “flowing with honey”—honey which man could turn to great profit, if he would skilfully avail himself of it.

Even when we come to what may, in a country like Britain, be regarded as the ultimate sterility of a dry surface, namely, to those accumulations of sand, which, in various places, come between the fertile plain and the sea, we do not find that they are barren. Landward, various kinds of bent rise up with exceedingly strong and firm stems, preventing the sand from being carried, by the influence of the wind, over the cultivated country. Farther to seaward, but still upon the dry surface, we are, ever and anon, coming upon four beautifully mottled eggs, symmetrically arranged in the form of a cross, while the fleet birds, to which they are a treasure, run to and fro, whistling and wailing, as if imploring us not to plunder their small and simple domestic establishment. Then, as the high-water line is approached, a different scene presents itself. Life meets us at every step; and the sand appears to be literally animated, by the countless myriads of flying and leaping creatures of small size, which are constantly rising from its surface, and again descending to their place of rest.

What we have here stated may be considered as descriptive of the three steps upon the most sterile surface of the earth, from the barrenness of the mountain top, to the barrenness, if barrenness it can be called, of the ocean strand. It will readily occur to every one, that the comparative sterility of the several situations, arises chiefly from the absence of water. It follows, therefore, that

both in the beauty and the value of the earth, water is the essential element. The facts tell us so. The first dripping of an infant rill from the mountain rock, will contrive, at least, to foster the green moss, even though the elevation is yet too great, and the cold too habitually intense, to allow it to nourish any other kind of verdure. The little rivulets, which dance down the mountain slopes, now leaping from a little rock, and now expanding in a glassy pool, contrive to seam the darkness of the heather, as if the mountain were clad in a mantle of purple, divided into segments by streaks of emerald. When the stream musters its forces, and swells into a river, we are all acquainted with its varied beauties, with the grandeur of its tide, and the countless uses of its waters, not only in the economy of nature, but in many of the arts of human life. And yet, how much remains to be learned from these "waves that are passing by us!" To how many purposes of utility, still unknown, might these waters be applied! Were skill employed, for example, in economising the rain which falls upon our uplands, and runs off in the flooding of our rivers, always carrying a portion of the most valuable soil along with it, it is not easy to calculate to what extent the productions of the field might be increased, and the labour of the husbandman diminished. This is the grand point of political economy—a point before which all the small and artificial projects of the systematists sink into insignificance—namely—that the whole bounty of heaven, in soil, in water, and in every thing that contributes to growth, shall be made to work equally and harmoniously to the greatest effect, and with the least exertion of human labour. The first portion of this involves the supply of plenty, the second, the existence of leisure on the part of the people, for mental improvement, and healthful recreation.

But if this principle is ever to be carried into operation, in a rational and philosophic manner, the study of the waters must necessarily form an important element in the process. Look only to the composition of our earth. To say nothing of the streams and rivers and lakes which intersect the land, seven-tenths of the whole surface of the globe are covered with seas and oceans, united with each other in one continuous, though irregularly formed extent. And can we look at that wisdom of design, which pervades creation, and yet suppose that, surface for surface, the sea is less valuable in nature's economy than the land?

It is not, however, with the waters, considered in themselves, but with their living inhabitants, and with the manner in which those inhabitants are drawn from their liquid element for the use

of man, that we have to deal in the present instance. As regards these, there is a considerable distinction to be made between the fresh waters and the sea. The former would appear to have been devoted to amusement. There are some instances, indeed, in which a fresh water fishery is carried on, solely with a view to mercantile profit, and without any enjoyment on the part of those who are actually engaged in it, farther than the hope of earning a subsistence for themselves and their families. This, however, is the exception, not the rule. Fresh water fishing, in the proper sense of the word, is entitled to take its place among what are called "field sports;" and, in the pleasure which it affords to those engaged in it, as well as in the effect which it appears to have in softening the heart, and rendering the affections bland and kindly, experience has certainly convinced us that it is superior to every other. It is to this subject that Mr. Jesse's light, lively, and most entertaining volume is directed: though we must acknowledge that he points out various modes of capture, which we would feel inclined to exclude from the limits of what may be called elegant and gentlemanly fishing,—we mean that kind of fishing, which derives its pleasure, not from the largeness, but from the glory, of the capture. The highest grade of the art is to fish for salmon, in a broad river, with a clear and rippling current; using no tackle, but an *angle*, that is a rod and line of the proper size and form, and an artificial fly or flies according to the season. It is not of the highest mode to use gaffing or a landing net, because these imply that the angler has not complete confidence in his own powers; and the pride of an angler, of the true school, consists in drawing out the leviathan of the clear flowing river—a gallant healthy salmon of some twenty to fifty pounds—"with a hook," unaided by any such vulgar operations, as snaring or stabbing.

It is true that the landing of a full-sized salmon of vigorous health (and no other should be landed by any means,) in this truly sportsman-like manner, requires a man of great vigour and experience. He must be prepared to wade breast-high into the current, to endure any quantity of scratching from bushes, to tumble upon slippery stones, and to ply his art under a thousand other casualties. Having hooked his fish, he is to allow it fairly to wear itself out by its own exertions, to toss and beat and tumble, until its strength is exhausted, and he can ground it on a convenient shallow as easily as a piece of floating wood. Then, taking it by the nose and tail, and lifting it carefully to the bank, let him dispatch it by that single blow, which every experienced fisher knows so well how and where to give, and which leaves every flake in the finest condition, and rich in its natural cream.

This, however, is not every body's work ; nay, it is not, perhaps, the kind of fishing, in which there is the most general enjoyment. The ordinary fisher may, therefore, turn away from the broad river, and may ascend one of its feeders, till he reaches some lovely dell, where copse and meadow mingle their sequestered beauties, and where the chiding stream, disturbed, perhaps, by a cascade at the upper end, frets its alternate way, in ripple and pool, between the banks. There let him angle for trout. It is in such a place that he will enjoy that sweetness of nature which conduces so much to the softening of the human heart ; and which seldom fails to inspire the angler with a love of nature, and nature's beauteous productions. It has been said that angling is a cruel sport ; but in these cases the question is to be tried, not by the real or supposed pain inflicted on the dumb animal, but by the effect produced upon the mind of the party practising it. Now, as we have already hinted, anglers, from old Izaak Walton downwards, have been men of the most kindly and gentle dispositions ; and publications, on the practice of angling, have usually more both of warm heartedness and of glee in them, than books on almost any other topic, not even excluding those on the subject of flowers.

The two works, whose titles we have quoted, furnish ample proof of this ; for though Mr. Yarrell's takes a wider and more methodical range, than that of Mr. Jesse, yet the buoyancy, and benevolence of the fisher, very often get uppermost even with him, notwithstanding the extent and the profundity of his science. We must, however, defer our particular remarks on these two most competent authors, and their delightfully instructive and entertaining productions, until we have exhausted our privilege of telling our own story.

Sea fishing, we have said, contrasts with fresh water fishing, as a regular trade contrasts with a field sport ; and it is remarkable, that the fishermen who live by levying contributions on the riches of the deep, are more exclusively devoted to their calling, and less fitted for any thing else, than almost any class that can be named. This extends, not merely to the fishermen, but to their families ; and there are many parts of the country, where, in manners, and even in language, the inhabitants of a fishing village are as different from the peasantry of the adjoining country, as if they lived beyond the sea, and not on its nearer margin.

There is another contrast between sea fishing and fresh-water fishing, which is of still greater importance. The fresh-water fishing, even in those lands of lakes and streams, which are most favourable for it, is comparatively limited, although many of the

species are highly prolific. Their range, in fact, is confined; and, as fishes prey upon each other,—the larger ones preying indiscriminately upon the smaller fry, including that of their own species—they are endowed with powers within themselves, of maintaining a very reasonable Malthusian equality between their numbers, and the supply of food. With the sea it is very different. The volume of water there is immense; and there are fishes inhabiting and finding food over its whole range, and to a considerable depth, varying, of course, with the temperature and productiveness of the waters. Some are discursive, near the surface, and never go to any very great depth; as is the case with the herring and mackerel families, and many others. Some are found in the mid-waters, and are still rather discursive in their habits; and some again inhabit the banks and bottoms at various depths, and seldom move far from the same locality. But whatever may be the general habit of the species, or the tribe, their numbers are beyond all arithmetic, and their powers of increase are perfectly astonishing. Some produce little short of ten millions at a time; others, perhaps, not so many hundreds: but so far as has been ascertained by experiment, it is, perhaps, not far from the truth to estimate the average of increase at a million. With regard to the times, at which this extraordinary power of nature is repeated, we are very much in the dark. The analogy of land animals would lead us to conclude, that it was annual, though we cannot speak positively upon the subject. If this, however, be the case, let us only imagine what would be the increase, if there were no means provided for keeping down the numbers. It does not appear that there is the same fixed term of life in fishes, as there is in vertebrated land animals. The death of the latter, when it comes without casualty, seems to originate in the bones, which do not increase in size after the maturity of the animal, and which begin to be absorbed, and waste away in its decrepitude. To the growth of bones in fishes there does not appear to be any such limit, nor, we believe has there ever been found any sign of absorption of the bones in an old fish. Hence, if the productive powers of sea fishes were to work undisturbed, and no casualty from without were to affect the produce, the sea would become, not only solid with fish, but absolutely mountain high, in the course of a very limited number of years.

But nature, which always has a resource at hand, provides against this consequence, by allowing the tribes in question, as it is usually said, to enjoy themselves in eating one another. Nor is this the only way in which their numbers are kept down. Numerous kinds of shore birds, and other land animals, live upon the eggs and spawn of fishes; and, as if it were to provide for

the subsistence of these creatures, different tribes and species of fishes deposit their spawn, at different times of the year. Some commit it to the waters, some fasten it to sea-weed and other substances, and some approach the shores with it, or enter the estuaries, and even ascend far up the branches of the rivers, for the same purpose. It is this which gives rise to those migrations of fishes, of which so many ridiculous stories used to be told, but which in all the correctly observed cases, are now ascertained to be nothing more than movements towards the shores and shallows, for the purpose of spawning, and back into the deep water, for the recovery of their health and flesh.

The approach to the shore appears to be for the purpose of exposing the eggs to the more powerful action of the sun and atmospheric air; and the purpose for which the rivers and brooks are ascended, appears to be exactly the same. There is one important point, connected with this matter, the clearing up of which we owe to Mr. Yarrell. White bait, and some other delicate species, come to the top of the brackish water for this purpose; and they obviously do so, because the temperature there is higher than it is, either in the salt water below, or in the fresh water above. Mr. Yarrell has proved, on the most unquestionable evidence, that white bait, though a member of the herring family, is a distinct species, and not the young of the shad, as was formerly supposed; just in the same manner as the sprat is a distinct species, and not the young of the herring. Mr. Yarrell was also the first to prove, in a satisfactory manner, that eels are not, as was formerly imagined, viviparous; but that they spawn like other fishes; and that those worm-shaped substances, often found in the viscera, are really *entozoa*, or intestinal worms, parasites upon the animal, and not its progeny. He was also the first, satisfactorily to demonstrate, that, in many rivers, at least, eels descend the stream in autumn, and pass the winter in the mud, in knots of many together, and in a sort of hibernating, or dormant state. It would far exceed our limits, however, to point out either what Mr. Yarrell has done himself, or what his stimulating example has caused to be done by others, in promoting a correct and philosophical knowledge of the economy of fishes, whether of the fresh water, or of the salt, or migratory between both.

Still, we must observe, that these are labours deserving of the highest honour, in a philosophical, and, yet more remarkably, in an economical point of view. Even now, the harvest of the sea, around the British shores, is abundant: even now, we are constantly hearing of the plenty of the waters being abundantly brought in, as a supply, where otherwise there would have been

famine in the land. Yet, the knowledge of the subject is still but in its infancy. Much remains to be acquired; and there is no reason why, if sufficient talent, skill, and capital, were made to bear upon it, it might not be increased, a hundred, a thousand, aye, many thousand fold. The resource is boundless. The men who have hitherto taken fish, or attended to the fisheries, have been proverbial for their want of knowledge of the philosophy of nature. Therefore, we have only to acquire wisdom, and apply industry, in order to fetch, from the all-bountiful sea, any supply we may require of the most wholesome food, at an exceedingly low price, and at any time of the year, if the weather is such that a fishing boat may live upon the water.

It is customary to say, and to publish, that such a kind of fish is in season, at one time of the year, and not in season at another: but there is one species which may be said to be in season all the year round—namely, the sole. Now, the sole not only spawns like other fishes, but it is an exceedingly prolific fish, and therefore, must be exhausted as well as the others. In fact, upon the more shallow fishing grounds, it is found to be soft and watery, in part of February and March; and yet, even then, all that is necessary is, to go into deeper water, and good soles are to be obtained.

Now, this fact speaks volumes, and tells us, that, if we would follow the other fishes into deeper water, we should also find them good at all seasons of the year. Fishes, of whatever species, inhabiting the same ground, do not all spawn in one day, or week, or month; and all therefore, that we have to do is, to find out where the good ones are, and devise means of taking them. The sole is among the least discursive of all fishes, and, consequently, we find it always good within a limited range. We should, of course, have to follow the other species to greater distances, in proportion as their characters were more ranging; yet there is little doubt but that one and all of them might be found. In a national point of view, this is one of the most important questions which can well be imagined. The land has to be ploughed, and kept in condition, at great expense; and rent and other burdens have to be paid for it, before the labouring cultivator can obtain a return: but the sea is as free as the air over it, and it requires nothing but to gather in the harvest.

We have, because it is in a great measure new to the generality of readers, gone into the subject of sea fishing at some length; and thus we have but little space to devote to the works of Messrs. Yarrell and Jesse. Much, however, is not necessary. Mr. Yarrell's work, being published in nineteen monthly numbers, and completed on the first of September last, came gradually



before the public, and has already, we are sure, produced the happiest effects. It contains brief, but remarkably clear, accurate, and satisfactory notices of every species of fish, and also every variety, hitherto found in the fresh waters and seas of Britain. These notices include the manners, if any thing peculiar, and also the mode of capture. They are full of information, are often graphic and amusing in a very high degree, and, being founded upon actual observation, may always be implicitly depended on. As a specimen of the information contained in Mr. Yarrell's most excellent volumes, we give a portion of his spirited account of "sean-fishing" for pilchards on the Cornish coast, regretting that our limits will not admit of our quoting the whole.

"The sean used for this purpose is 120 fathoms, or 720 feet long, which is more than a furlong, and twelve fathoms, or 72 feet in depth, floated with corks on the head-rope, and kept taut by sinkers below. There are three boats, a large *sean boat*, a rather smaller *volger*, and a still smaller *lurker*. There are seven hands in each of the large boats, and four and the master-fisher in the small one. The small one finds the schull (shoal); ascertains its direction, and instructs the others how to pay out the net, stretch it by parting, and present a moderate bight toward the advancing fish. Notwithstanding the size of the net, it is payed out and ready in about five minutes, all in perfect silence, without the least splash, of an oar. If the water is deep, a different kind of net, 108 feet deep, is used, with a bunt or hollow at the middle.

"When the net is out, the two boats advance with the ends, the lurker splashing and making a noise to drive the fish on; and the ends of the net are ultimately brought and fastened together. The haul may vary from a single hogshhead to a thousand hogshheads of fish; and when it is large, the net is secured by grapplings, lest the strength of the fish should carry it off to sea. At low water, the fish are raised, by placing a tuck-sean within it, by which the fish are brought within a smaller compass, and raised by closing the bottom of this second sean. During this operation, noise, shouting, and stones suspended by ropes, and plunged into the water, are practised, until the opening of the net is closed, and the fish are lodged in the bunt, in which they can be raised to the surface, and taken into the boat.

"When brought to the surface, the voices of the men are lost in the noise made by the fish, as they beat the water. The seaners fix themselves in pairs on the gunwales of the boats, with flasks, to lade the fish on board. When the quantity enclosed in the stop-sean is large, the tuck-sean is made to enclose no more than the boats can carry, of which a master-seaner forms a correct judgment by the extent of brimming in his sean, as the fish move in it; and many advantages result from taking up only a portion at one time, for the whole can thus be salted in proper condition, without fatigue, or extraordinary expense. Thus, a week may possibly elapse, before the whole of the capture is secured, part being taken up every night."—Vol. ii. p. 100.

The whole description is remarkably well given, and so is every fishing process described in the book; and there are many brief, but satisfactory observations, on the anatomy, physiology, and habits of fishes. The arrangement is that of Cuvier, beginning with the spinous-finned tribes, passing to those having the rays of the fins jointed, and ending with those which have the skeleton cartilaginous. The last are the lancelet, in which the vertebrated character is nearly obliterated, thus forming a transition, or rather approximation, to the invertebrated character closing the list. The excellence of the arrangement cannot be questioned; and we may say with truth, that there are few, perhaps no, books, which have brought larger accessions of knowledge to any one department of natural history, than "Yarrell's History of British Fishes."

The illustrations are exceedingly beautiful and valuable. Every species is figured from nature, under the author's inspection in the majority of cases; and where such is not the fact, it is mentioned. We have seldom seen wood-cuts executed with so much truth and spirit; and we are quite sure, that any one who possesses the figure, can be at no loss in instantly recognizing the fish, whenever, and wherever, he may happen to meet with a specimen. Nor are these the only illustrations of these two excellent volumes; for there are numerous interspersed cuts of dissections, peculiar organs, apparatus, and modes of procedure in the capture of fish. Besides these, there are a number of "sweet bits," in the way of tail pieces, all connected with the waters, and fish, and fishing, which, if they have not the pointedly sarcastic humour of some of Bewick's matchless tail-pieces, are, at least, more chaste in design, and finer in the execution. In fact, the work is perfectly unique, as well it may be imagined, by every one acquainted with the industry, the talent, the glee, and the liberality of the amiable and excellent author; and no man who loves either fishing or fish ought to be without it. If a nautical expression might be allowed, in closing this brief notice of the best account that has ever been given of the finny inhabitants of the British seas, we would say, that Mr. Yarrell is no mere Ichthyologist, but can "box the compass of animated nature, either with the sun, or agen it, without missing a single point."

Mr. Jesse's volume is quite of a different structure. With all the lightness of a lounging book, it has all the depth of a philosophic treatise; and, though with an aim and purpose entirely different, is not inferior, in its way, to Mr. Yarrell's more elaborate and systematic work. The fact is, that the two authors are as sworn brothers, in the pleasing contemplation of nature; and

that their brotherhood is the result of very strong resemblance in mind and feeling. Mr. Jesse begins with an account of Thames fishing, and shows how even the most wily inhabitants of its gentle tide may be taken with the greatest ease and the most perfect certainty. We regret our inability to record any of the mighty trout which have been landed from this river; but we cannot resist mentioning the following deed in the article of salmon:—

“October 3, 1812, at Shepperton Deep, Mr. G. Marshall, of Brewer Street, London, caught a salmon with *single gut*, without a landing-net, weighing twenty-one and a quarter pounds.”

This is the way that a salmon ought to be caught.

Mr. Jesse next proceeds to discuss the method of trolling in Staffordshire, and intersperses his account with some prettily told stories, for which we regret that we have no room, though Cleaveland Hall, and various other attractions, beckon us onward. Next comes the “Perch Fishing Club,” and then the “Two day fly-fishing on the banks of the Test.” “The Leckford Fishing Club” is the next on the tapis, and they introduce some very interesting hints and instructions to anglers. To this follows fishing for the grayling, and a visit to Oxford. Then the “country clergyman” figures onward to the end of the book. We have known many a country clergyman, who thrashed the waters like a very Gideon, but thrashed them in vain; and who, consequently, would have given the “tithe of his own tithes,” for the tithe of the information contained in Mr. Jesse’s book. It is even a lighter book in the playful parts than “*Salmonia*,” by the late Sir Humphry Davy; and when the two parties bring their tackle into action, if they had been on the same water at the same time, we certainly should have preferred taking our dish of fish with Mr. Jesse.

But we must break from this engaging subject; for we could write a month without exhausting it. Angling is a delightful sport, and fishing a most lucrative employment; and individuals and the country cannot be too grateful to Mr. Yarrell and Mr. Jesse for their two most instructive and delightful books.

**ART. XI.—***Report of a Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Royal Dublin Society.* Ordered to be printed in the Session of 1836.

**THE** present state of Ireland is said to be a political anomaly. The contrary is the fact. Were the country different from what it is, were it prosperous and tranquil, after centuries upon centuries of systematic mismanagement, it might indeed be pronounced an anomaly, a contradiction to every principle of sound

reasoning, and to every deduction of common sense. Many of our modern economists, in their eagerness to apply some favourite specific, look no farther than the prominent results, which force themselves first on their attention. In their hurry to effect an instantaneous cure, they prescribe merely for the symptoms, and then are astonished that the remedies, that have succeeded in cases apparently similar, should here prove utterly ineffectual, if not pernicious. The truth is, that the causes of the disease lie infinitely deeper than these persons imagine. The virus of corrupt legislation has been so long suffered to work its way through the system, that it has infected every pore and fibre of the body politic; and it is not, therefore, by ordinary means, or by the application of ordinary remedies, that we can hope to see the malady removed, and the health of the patient permanently restored.

To account for the miseries of Ireland, it is not necessary to lead the enquirer back to the earlier periods of British connexion. An impartial review of the circumstances of the country, since the revolution in 1688, will sufficiently explain its present situation; and we think the reader, as he peruses the history, will wonder, not that the people are wretched, and the land impoverished, but that the wretchedness and poverty of both are not infinitely more deplorable.

The Revolution is one of the great eras of Irish history. At that time, the country changed masters. The change was radical,—not merely the substitution of one dynasty for another, of a Nassau for a Stuart, of a Whig for a Tory domination: it extended over the whole surface, it affected every acre of the soil, and penetrated to the hearth even of the poorest cottier. The wars of 1641 and 1688, occasioned, with a few insignificant exceptions, a sudden and violent transfer of the landed property of the whole kingdom. The old possessors, whose interests, and habits, and feelings, had been identified with those of the great mass of the population, by the tenure of centuries, were at once ousted; a swarm of hungry adventurers, the refuse of the army, or the dregs of the London shopkeepers, was introduced; and the scenes, which, in another clime, and in another age, had marked the subjugation of the Red Indians, were re-enacted, in the seventeenth century, on the shores of Ireland.

The new settlers, having obtained possession of the soil, partly by the expatriation of the native wealth, spirit, and intelligence of the country, and partly by the removal, into remote and barren districts, of those who wanted either the spirit or the pecuniary means to emigrate, proceeded to secure the permanency of their tenure by a series of laws, most elaborately and ingeniously concocted between the Parliaments of Dublin and Westminster, for the

eradication of what still lingered of the manufactures, the agriculture, the education, and the religion of the people. In this task they proceeded with equal energy and success. They had nothing, in fact, to restrain them. Laws, made by the new settlers for the purposes of ignorant and tyrannical domination, were responded to by others, framed in their mother country in a kindred spirit of blind oppression and selfish monopoly. On both sides, they were passed as soon as proposed. Nothing remained to check the insolence and cruelty of the tyrant. The Irish were conquered, depressed, and prostrate. Existence was the only right allowed them, and even this was rather tolerated than acknowledged. "The law," says one of the English lawyers, sent over to fill a vacancy on the Irish Bench, "the law does not recognise the existence of a papist in the country."

The history of the period, now before us, affords ample proof of the state of destitution to which these proceedings speedily reduced the country. Swift, in his "*Short View of the State of Ireland*," written in 1727, tells us, that "the want of industry of the people is not altogether owing to our own fault, but to a million of discouragements." "Ireland," continues he, "is the only kingdom I ever heard of, either in ancient or modern story, which was denied the liberty of exporting their native commodities and manufactures, wherever they pleased, except to countries at war with their own prince or state. Yet this privilege, by the superiority of mere power, is refused us, in the most momentous parts of commerce; besides an act of navigation, to which we never consented, pinned down upon us, and rigorously executed. . . . Those who have the misfortune to be born here, have the least title to any considerable employment." Two years afterwards, the overflowings of his proud and sensitive heart, at the still increasing wretchedness of his country, burst forth in that most caustic and biting satire, sent into the world under the attractive title of, "*A modest Proposal for preventing the Children of Poor People in Ireland from being a Burthen to their Parents or Country, and for making them beneficial to the Public*." In this "modest proposal," he recommends that the "children of the poor may be offered in sale to the people of quality and fortune, as an article of food. A child," says he, "will make two dishes at an entertainment for friends; and, when the family dineth alone, the fore or hind quarter will make a reasonable dish; and, seasoned with a little pepper and salt, will be very good boiled, on the fourth day, especially in winter. . . . I grant," continues he, in the same tone of bitter sarcasm, "that this food will be somewhat dear, and, therefore, very proper for landlords; who, as they have already devoured most of the parents, seem to have

the best title to the children." The act of Primate Boulter, passed about the same period, to *compel* each landholder to till five out of every hundred acres in his possession, affords a grave and serious confirmation of the hideous picture revealed to us in the scourging irony of Swift.

A simple mode of remedying the ruinous effects of the measures adopted by the new settlers, would have been to retrace their own steps, to break down the artificial barriers which they had so industriously erected, and to allow the great natural energies of the people full scope. But the new and unwilling connection, which had grown up between landlord and tenant, forbade this proceeding. In the country whence they had emigrated, these terms conveyed an idea of all that was fostering and endearing,—a reciprocity of kindly feelings based upon a reciprocity of interests, an interchange of paternal protection and grateful, cordial obedience. In Ireland, it was the reverse of all this: it was the iron bond of master and slave. Terror was the ruling principle—severity, unqualified by any gentle feeling, the instrument. The landlord looked on every cottier as a lurking enemy: the tenant viewed the proprietor as an usurping tyrant. The former gave employment only because his lands would otherwise be worthless: the latter yielded his labour only as a desperate alternative against starvation. From elements so anti-social, what was to be looked for but a continuance of bitter, ill-disguised enmity? In such a state of things, to relax the rigour of penal and prohibitory legislation, would have been, in the opinion of the ruling caste, to let loose the famished tiger. Yet the country could not remain in its present condition. It was running rapidly to ruin. The wretchedness of the tenants was recoiling upon the landlords, and the landlords were already beginning to smart sorely under the reaction.

At this conjuncture, a few well-meaning individuals, who saw the evil, and doubtless felt its pressure upon themselves, laid their heads together; and, according to the usual custom among well-meaning people, agreed that "something must be done." This something, however, meant anything that would not trench upon the system of coercive legislation, which they, in common with their party, deemed essential, not merely to their welfare, but even to their very existence. Half measures, the usual resource of little-minded politicians, were, therefore, resorted to. A thousand plans were proposed, a thousand expedients were adopted; and the political empiricism of the time rose at once to the heyday of its glory. Among a variety of other schemes, it was thought possible to effect the revival of the agricultural and manufacturing interests of the country, by means of a society, which should

diffuse instruction on these subjects by its publications, and stimulate emulation by medals, premiums, and other such excitements. Hence arose the Dublin Society, in 1731, not more than thirty years after the final prostration of the native energies and capabilities of the country, consequent upon the decisive action off La Hogue. This association, though limited in numbers, and not very remarkable for rank or influence, entertained ideas sufficiently magnificent of its own capabilities. The number of associates was, for several years, less than a hundred; yet it was to be an association for the general improvement of Ireland, and the name, by which it was to be designated, was that of "*The Dublin Society for improving Husbandry, Manufactures, and other useful Arts and Sciences.*" It was one of the fundamental rules, that every member should specifically apply himself to the furtherance of some particular branch of its operations. In 1749, it obtained the charter of incorporation, under which it still continues to act; and, for some years previously, it received an annual grant of £500 from the king's privy purse, which was afterwards so considerably augmented, as to give an average of £5000 during a series of years. In some instances, the grant amounted to £10,000. The money, thus entrusted to it, was chiefly expended in premiums, some for improvements in agriculture, others for the reclamation of waste lands, for planting, for the fisheries, for new or improved branches of manufacture, for inventions of every description, for ingenious works of art, and for investigations, both statistical and antiquarian, connected with the country. Subsequently to the Union, it received an annual parliamentary grant of £10,000, which was continued, at that rate, till 1819, when it was first reduced to £7000, and afterwards, in 1830, to something more than £5000. At the last named period, its operations were, to a certain degree, contracted by the formation of another society, exclusively agricultural, which also received a large grant of public money. But, as the extension of public liberality to the newly-formed body was not made at the expense of its precursor, the only effect, produced by it on the Dublin Society, was, that the time and money, hitherto devoted to agriculture, were diverted to other objects, and that the fine arts received a more enlarged share of its attention. Latterly, the objects to which the Society has chiefly devoted itself, have been the advancement of the useful and ornamental arts, and the diffusion of a knowledge of natural history and physical science. To promote the former, schools of elementary instruction in the art of drawing were, in the first instance, established, and a collection of statues and casts was made: to advance the latter, a botanical garden, a museum, and a repository for models

was formed, while a certain number of scientific individuals was appointed, who were expected to perform the double function of delivering gratuitous courses of public lectures, and of giving private information, to such as might choose to seek it, on points connected with their respective departments.

As to the funds, whereby all these purposes were to be effected, the summary, already given, of the parliamentary grants, comprises nearly the whole. There were, indeed, some individual subscriptions; but these were comparatively trifling, and we possess no means at present of ascertaining their precise amount. In fact, the accounts of the society, previously to the Union, were so carelessly kept, that even the officers of the present day, who might be supposed qualified, both from duty and inclination, to give information on the subject, could state nothing, or next to nothing, respecting them, in their late evidence before Parliament.—Since the Union, the mode of assessing the contributions of the members has undergone several changes. Originally, the annual subscription, entitling the payer to the privileges of a member, was thirty shillings. In 1801, it was either an annual payment of three guineas, with an admission fee of five, or a life payment of twenty guineas. In 1810, the admission fee was raised to thirty guineas, and again, in 1816, to fifty; but, in 1821, this last addition was removed; and, eight years later, a further reduction brought it down to the sum of twenty guineas, at which it still remains.

The total amount of funds derived from Parliamentary grants, and from the payments of members, from 1801 to 1835 inclusive, stands thus:—

	Total.	Yearly average.
Parliamentary grants - -	£291,706	£8334
Subscriptions of members -	20,028	572
Total for 35 years - - -	£311,734	£8906

The manner in which the funds were employed, is involved in utter obscurity. All that can be ascertained, with any degree of certainty, is, that very large sums were laid out in building. The Society, after having held its meetings, for many years, in hired apartments, erected a house in Grafton Street. But this was soon found to be too small for the effectual prosecution of the multifarious objects which the members had taken in charge. They, therefore, hired a large-piece of ground in Hawkins' Street; and, having first erected a repository for implements and models, they afterwards added a library, a board-room, and other apartments successively, and the whole establishment was, at length, transferred to the new buildings. Here, however, it was not



destined to remain. The edifice, ill-designed and ill-constructed, was so inconvenient as to be almost useless, and so damp as to be alike injurious to the health of the residents, and destructive of the articles deposited in their custody. The Society soon determined to abandon the place; and having, therefore, disposed of its interest in it, for what it would bring, it speedily transferred itself to its present splendid residence in Kildare Street, where, also, large additional buildings were found to be immediately wanting, in order to carry on the public business.

That the Society, for some time after its commencement, stood high in the estimation of the public, or, at least, of that portion of it, which had any influence in the management of public affairs, is evident from the numerous donations and bequests bestowed upon it, many of them anonymous, and in sums of ten, twenty, fifty pounds, and upwards. But latterly the current of popular opinion has taken a course diametrically opposite; and the large amount of its expenditure, compared with the small appearance of any beneficial results, has produced an annually increasing conviction of its inadequacy to effect its original object—the practical regeneration of the country. It was the general expression, in fact, of this conviction, that compelled Parliament, in 1820, to diminish the usual grant; and there can be little doubt, that the same cause has since operated in inducing that body to act on the principle of continued reduction, and to withdraw from the society at least one-half of its original allowance. Nor is this all. A few years ago, a financial committee of the House of Commons subjected the expenditure of the society to a rigid and searching investigation. The result was, that, in the last session, it was thought advisable to resume the enquiry; and, for this purpose, a Select Committee was appointed, with instructions to take the whole of the case into consideration, and report fully upon it.

The Report of this Committee is now before us. Though short, it details the management of every department of the Society; and concludes with a series of recommendations for improving its constitution and internal economy,—the grounds of which are developed more at large in a very voluminous body of evidence, both oral and written, attached to the Report, and forming nearly the whole of the bulky folio, of which the Report and its appendages consist.

This document shows at once, that public opinion was justified in condemning the Society. It exhibits a picture of deplorable mismanagement of the funds, and of an equally deplorable disregard of the objects which its charter professes to have in view. Nor is there reason to doubt the accuracy of its statements. The

whole of the evidence, spread over three hundred and fifty-five folio pages, is drawn either from officers, or members of the body, persons, who, as they possessed an interest in the establishment, would naturally feel inclined to place its proceedings in the most favourable point of view. The evidence of two of the officers, Mr. Isaac Wild, honorary secretary, and Dr. Samuel Litton, lecturer on botany, the only officers examined, occupies upwards of a third of the whole. The other witnesses were gentlemen of respectability, and of some degree of note as literary or scientific characters.

The whole of the evidence, thus adduced in favour of the society, we repeat, fully justifies the impression, so strong on the public mind, that the affairs of the institution were grossly mismanaged. On this point, all the witnesses coincide, as far as past management is concerned. All of them agree in saying, that, at the present time, when the Society is upon half allowance, things are going on better. All, likewise, except one, unite in opinion, that some further radical change in its constitution is necessary, in order to justify Parliament in entrusting it, any longer, with the expenditure of so large an amount of the public money.

The spirit of negligence, or of something worse than negligence, revealed by this evidence, seems to have affected every branch of the Society. It is discernible every where. Was it not to have been expected, that a society of gentlemen, entrusted with the discretionary annual expenditure of £10,000 for purposes of the highest public interest, would be able, when called on, to give some satisfactory account of the manner in which they had discharged their important trust? But what is the fact? Not only were no accounts produced before the committee, except, indeed, for the three or four years which have elapsed since the concerns of the Society became an object of public enquiry, but it is acknowledged by its accredited officer, that it had none to produce. The answers, relative to every other department, exhibit the same spirit of indolent neglect, scarcely concealed by a pompous display of effort at doing something to justify a continuance of national confidence. Agriculture, one of the two main points on which the Society originally founded its claim to public favour and patronage, was, at one time, as we have already stated, consigned entirely to the care of another society; and although, on the extinction of that society, this branch of its duties was afterwards resumed, yet it was, on a principle as useless and as indolent, as could well have been imagined.

The absurdity of an attempt to revive the agriculture of a nation, labouring under a vicious and partial system of law, by the distribution of a few silver medals, to be hung, we suppose,

at the button-holes of the farmers when going to fairs, or markets, or to church or chapel on Sundays, is too glaring to be dwelt upon. The cattle-shows, as is acknowledged by the secretary of the Society, in his examination, so far from producing any general effect, can have no influence beyond the vicinity of Dublin, where, it is evident, such an artificial stimulus is least wanted.

A just idea of the attention paid to horticulture will be best conveyed by an extract from the secretary's evidence on that point.

"Q. What is the extent of the botanic garden ?

"A. About twenty-seven acres, I think.

"Q. Have you examined any other botanic garden in Ireland ?

"A. There is a botanic garden in Dublin, belonging to the College, consisting of a small quantity of ground, (not more than eight acres,) which, until very lately, had a much higher character than that of the Society.

"Q. What was the character of the late curator of the Society's botanic garden ?

"A. The late curator, at one time, many years ago, was highly thought of; but he continued in the garden long after he had lost all character, either for talent or good conduct; and it was generally considered to be owing to his neglect that the garden got into the disgraceful condition, in which it had been, previous to the appointment of the present curator. Now the botanic garden at Glasnevin has a very high character, particularly for taste and beauty of arrangement: it is, perhaps, rather more of a beautiful than a scientific garden. The scientific arrangement has not been much changed—the Linnean arrangement is preserved—there is yet no natural arrangement. The extent of the garden rather induces the persons who have the care of it, to look on it as an ornamental, than a scientific, garden. If they were confined to a much smaller space, they would rely more on the scientific part, and less on its beauty.

"Q. I see, by the original regulations, that a certain portion of this garden was to be made use of for agricultural purposes; is that the case now ?

"A. Yes. Mr. Niven (the curator) has raised a great many new varieties of potatoes. He appears to have made a great many most important experiments, upon the cultivation of potatoes in the garden. There is an arboretum, containing a great number of trees, the spaces between which Mr. N. has contrived to cover with grass, which has a pretty appearance.

"Q. You say agricultural experiments have been tried in the garden: what has become of the produce of these experiments ?

"A. As I understand, the produce has not been of an extent to make it an object of any great consequence, except with regard to potatoes.

"Q. Are there a great number of fruit trees ?

"A. These are new things with us."

In other parts of this portion of the evidence, we are informed that Mr. Niven is all life and activity : that he wrote a letter to the Duke of Northumberland, and received an answer, written with the Duke's own hand ; and that, at the meeting of the British Association, in Dublin, last summer, there was but one opinion of the garden,—that it was the most beautiful that existed,—together with some other facts of similar importance. In short, the whole of the evidence, which here, as in other parts, appears to have been drawn forth very tortuously, may be summed up in the facts, that the garden is very beautiful, and not very scientific—that the curator is an animal all life and activity—that he has contrived to coax grass to grow, and introduced certain novel species of plants, called fruit trees—and that the Duke of Northumberland writes his letters with his own hand ! We think we may well exclaim, with our old friend Dominie Samson—prodigious !

Manufactures, the other great department marked down in the original plan of the society, after having been virtually relinquished for years, have lately been fortunate enough to regain the attention of the managers. For their encouragement, an annual exhibition has been established, and medals, of which some may be seen in the shop-windows of the trading streets of Dublin, have been distributed. But here the fostering care of the society ceases. An exhibition and a medal !—as if trade was to be revived, and the manufactures of a country improved, by such paltry and insignificant means !

Lectures on some of the sciences, applicable to rural economy and manufactures, have latterly, to a certain degree, been substituted for essays and premiums. The intrinsic value of these lectures has been tested by a very fair experiment. During a series of years, in which they were delivered gratuitously, the lecture rooms were numerously attended, sometimes even to overflowing. But, on a small fee being fixed for each course, the audiences, dwindled away almost to nothing. Those who had attended them, for the purpose of ~~wasting~~ <sup>utilising</sup> away a vacant hour, absented themselves when they were called upon for a mere trifle, in payment of their literary amusement : those, who would be inclined to pay for useful information, were impressed with the idea, that, either from the want of talent in the lecturer, or from the nature of the course prescribed for him, or, more probably, from both causes together, they were not likely to receive an adequate remuneration for the time and money expended. The audiences, according to the evidence before us, were chiefly composed of the families of the members, and of the pupils from the adjacent free schools, in Kildare-place ; for both of which classes, the time of

lecturing (from three to four o'clock in the afternoon) was peculiarly convenient. The boys and girls were then just let out of school; and the ladies and gentlemen were enabled to kill a tedious hour before dinner. As for the working classes, who could only attend in the evenings, they and their interests seem to have been wholly unthought of. \*

The museum department was still worse. The answers to the enquiries of the committee, on this head, give the following results: Natural history? Very imperfect indeed. Collection of birds? Very small, and very incomplete. Geological collection? Very limited. Fishes? Very imperfect, and want classification and revision. Shells? Very imperfect. Fossil remains? Very few.\* Comparative anatomy? Nothing illustrative of it. Antiquities? A small collection of Etruscan vases, some Roman remains, and a **VERY FINE MUMMY!** Collection of Irish minerals? A disgrace to the society. Indeed, without entering into the details of this catalogue of nonentities, the whole might have been summed up in the concise, yet most comprehensive, answer of another of the witnesses:—

“ Q. In what department do you consider the museum most defective ?

“ A. I should say there is scarcely any part, in which it is not defective.”

The library is in a less neglected state than any of the fore-mentioned departments. It contains a number, large in proportion to its total contents, of valuable scientific works; but its total is very small, when compared with the sums granted to the society. It is closed during the morning and evening hours, being accessible only from eleven to five, and then only to members, or to strangers admitted by special favour. It is also a lending library, for the exclusive use of the members and their families, the consequences of which are, that, as duplicates are not provided, to meet the double demand, an intern reader may be for months deprived of the use of a volume, while it is going its external rounds, and that, from the neglect of returning the books taken out, many works, named in the catalogue, are missing, and many sets are broken.

The news-room.—Many of our readers will be astonished to hear, that a news-room is here considered an essential appendage to a society for the practical improvement of agriculture and manufactures. Yet, so it is. The news-room forms no unimportant subject, either in the enquiries of the committee, or in the estimation of the society itself. True it is, that it does not cost much.

---

\* This answer is subsequently corrected where the respondent, Mr. Isaac Wild, secretary, says, that the society has no fossil remains, except the elk.

It is but the outlay of some seventy or eighty pounds a year, from an income of thousands. Yet insignificant as it appears in amount, it exhibits itself as a most important feature in the eyes of the members, both as a point of economy, and as an article of primary utility to the existence of the society. When, from an apprehension of the scrutinizing temper of parliament, it was determined to transfer the charge for newspapers from the public fund, to the private account of the individuals, the plan failed as a permanent measure; the members refused to pay the additional subscription, and the society was compelled either to revert to the public purse, or to give up the newspapers. The former alternative was adopted, on the ground that the absence of newspapers would seriously diminish the number of members.

On the subject of the school of fine arts, little need be said. It is one of the least essential in an institution for the practical improvement of the country. Statues and pictures are expensive luxuries, to be indulged in, only when the national prosperity furnishes a surplus for their enjoyment. When the labours of the Dublin society, or of any other body associated for similar patriotic purposes, shall have enabled the peasant to indulge in something more than potatoes, seven times a week, and to cover himself with something more comfortable and decent than threadbare frize, it will be time enough to talk of the appropriation of public money to the fine arts. At present, therefore, all that need be said on this part of our subject is, that the Dublin Society has made some precocious efforts to excite a taste for them in Ireland, or more correctly speaking in Dublin; and that these efforts have exhausted themselves in forming a gallery of some dozen of casts, and establishing drawing schools, where four teachers receive salaries of eighty pounds a year each for teaching nine hours in the week, and where a number of boys, admitted gratuitously, may attend whichever master, and during whatever time, they please.

Having thus taken a summary view of the objects of this institution, of the means resorted to for their accomplishment, and of the results produced by those means, it now remains only to enquire, what are the recommendations of the committee appointed to investigate the subject, and what are the measures which Parliament ought instantly to adopt. Before we enter upon these questions, however, it will be right to notice briefly the opinions of the witnesses examined—all of whom, it will be recollected, were members—as to the origin of the inefficiency visible in the society. That inefficiency arises, according to these gentlemen, from a single cause—the diminution of the annual grant, which has prevented the erection of buildings suitable to

the purposes of the institution. But, to say nothing of the wasteful, if not profligate, expenditure, incurred, as the reader has already seen, on the premises in Hawkins' Street, it must be remembered that the society purchased its present residence with its eyes open. The managers knew the extent of their income, they knew what Parliament expected from them, they saw the capabilities of Leinster House as it then stood: yet, with all these data to guide them, as to the policy of the purchase, they involved the body in an immense debt, for the purchase of a pile of building, which, so far from affording them additional scope, not only entailed on them the almost immediate necessity of erecting a theatre or lecture-room, a laboratory, a statue gallery, and nearly every other apartment for public accommodation; but, after all, left them in a situation to complain, that the efforts of the Society were rendered useless by a want of room. The heedlessness with which the managers plunged into this new speculation, after the warning example of Hawkins' Street, is still further exhibited by the following fact. The plot of ground, taken by them in Kildare Street, is held under two tenures. The portion, containing the buildings and the area in front, was the property of the Duke of Leinster. This they purchased in fee. The other portion, consisting of a lawn of about two acres, and extending from the rear of the main building to Merrion Square, is held *at will*, under a rent of £300 Irish. The landlord refuses to give any other tenure, and the Society deem the occupation of it essential, because, if it should fall into other hands, the buildings that might be erected upon it would, according to the statements of the witnesses,—the accuracy of which, however, we have reason to doubt,—materially tend to obstruct the light of the rear apartments. Be this, however, as it may, the Society is paying, and, for six and thirty years, has been paying, the annual sum of £300 Irish, amounting now to a total of £9969. 4s. 6d., for a plot of ground, which is available for no purpose but that of an airing-ground for the nurses and children of the members, and of a prospect to the houses in Merrion Square.

But what are the recommendations of the committee? It advises, in substance, that every thing shall remain as it is. *Quia tunc morietur*, seems to have been the principle that dictated the report, and quiet enough will the Society be, if the suggestions of the Committee are acted upon. The funds are still to be at its disposal, and the public are still to be excluded from their rightful participation in the benefits of the institution. But let the committee speak for itself. The principle, on which the Society is recommended to be regulated in future, is, that it "be considered as the great central association, for the diffu-

sion, throughout Ireland, of a knowledge of practical science, and of all improvements in agriculture, horticulture, and the arts."—But this is precisely what the Society would ever have been, had it performed its duty. And is it because it has neglected that duty, and forfeited its character, that the committee would preserve its existence, and recommend it to be "considered" as a something, which, by its own negligence, it had long since ceased to be? Or is this recommendation, which, by the way, so carefully excludes the mention of *manufactures*,—is it to give life, and energy, and reputation to that, which no power has hitherto been able to arouse?—The committee proceeds to lay it down, as another principle of organization, that the admission of all respectable individuals to participate in its advantages is most desirable; and, to effect this object, it recommends that no person shall be rejected, on the ballot, by a smaller number than forty members; that the admission shall be a single payment of twenty guineas, for life, or five guineas with an annual fee of two guineas; and that a class of associate members shall be formed, to be admitted *on the recommendation of two members of the Council*, and the payment of two guineas. It farther advises, that the whole management of the Institution shall be committed to a Council, to be formed, by a very complex operation, out of eight committees elected annually; that there shall be a general meeting of the Society once a year, with a power to call extraordinary meetings when necessary; that itinerant lecturers shall be sent through the country, under special regulations as to expense; that the Botanic Garden shall be made a school for young gardeners, and, together with the lawn, thrown open to the public, for study or enjoyment, *under regulations to be framed by the Council*; that a reading-room shall be opened, to which persons not belonging to the Society shall have access, by *SPECIAL permission* of the Council; that each professor shall deliver an evening course of gratuitous lectures, to be open to the public; that periodical reports of scientific proceedings shall be published; that newspapers and political periodicals shall be excluded; that the schools of the *fine arts* shall be confined to the useful and mechanical departments thereof; and that larger accommodation shall be provided for the Museum, by an extension of the buildings now in possession of the Society.

To discuss the merits of these resolutions in detail would be mere waste of time. They run directly counter to the great principle by which public bodies, entrusted with the expenditure of the public money, should be regulated. They not only continue to leave the funds of the establishment to the discretion of an irresponsible, fluctuating, and hitherto corrupt body, but they



also propose to introduce a change into its constitution, calculated only to render what is already bad infinitely worse. The complicated device of a Council, to be constructed out of eight committees, the committees to be annually elected by the proprietors, and the Council and committees to be then dovetailed into each other, by a strange and puzzling process of mutual introsusception, can only tend to make "confusion worse confounded." The library, which, if properly furnished, would be the most valuable part of the institution, is to be so regulated that, with the exception of the favoured few, who may be fortunate enough to obtain the special permission of the Council, the public are to be effectually excluded from it. In short, the suggestions of the report are concocted in the true spirit of Toryism. The Society is to be made a close borough, and its management is to be exclusively vested in a few influential individuals, with whom the Treasury may communicate, and coquet at pleasure, as to the amount and expenditure of the funds. Our surprise at such suggestions is increased by a perusal of the names of the members who constituted the committee. We ask ourselves, by what political hallucination could the understandings of such men as form the majority of these,—men of sound sense and enlarged political views,—be so far misled as to acquiesce in a series of recommendations, in direct opposition to every liberal and enlightened principle? Nothing, certainly, but the most mistaken notions, as to the actual situation of Ireland, can account for it: for certain we are, that, whatever the Society might be able to accomplish by its own unaided exertions, and by the judicious expenditure of funds, contributed solely by the members themselves; whatever minor improvements it might introduce, in the mode or implements of husbandry, the cultivation of potatoes, or the various species of fruit trees, it never can, by any subordinate, or secondary change in its constitution, be made an effectual instrument in the regeneration of the country. And this brings us to the only remaining question—what measures ought Parliament instantly to adopt?

To this question we reply broadly and explicitly, that, as Parliament ought not, in the first instance, to have entrusted any portion of the property of the people to a self-constituted and irresponsible body of individuals, so it is now bound to redeem its past error, as far as possible, and withdraw the grant which has hitherto supported the Society. Parliament is itself but the trustee for the people,—a delegated body, which has no right to transfer its trust. The expenditure of any portion of the public money, which it cannot immediately superintend, should be committed to officers, fully responsible for its due ap-

plication,—to men appointed by Parliament, bound down by sufficient securities for the fulfilment of their engagements, and, therefore, capable of being brought to account for every defalcation arising from misconduct or negligence.

The position here laid down, rests upon a double principle. It is based on the responsibility of the Parliament to the people, and of the officers of public institutions to the Parliament. Of its justice none can doubt: of its expediency, the history of every public institution in Ireland, constituted, as too many are, like the Dublin Society, will afford the best illustration. Take the Charter-school Society, for example. It started upon the joint-stock principle, of private benevolence and Parliamentary support; the former being to the latter, much in the same ratio as in the Dublin Society. Well, it ran its course; it was patronized, for a time, but it was, at length, weighed in the balance, and found wanting. Look, again, at the Association for Discountenancing Vice; at the Farming Society, already noticed; and, as affording a still more striking illustration of the principle, at the Kildare Place Society. Like the Dublin Society, this last undertook the task of regenerating Ireland; and its specific was Scriptural education. Like the Dublin Society, it expended much of its funds on buildings: like it, also, it failed in the attainment of its object. In short, turn where we will, we feel fully justified in asserting, that there is no instance of a voluntary association, to which Parliament has entrusted the expenditure of the public money for the interests of the people, in which the money has not been misapplied, and the government either left without redress, or driven into Chancery for the recovery of the trifling assets that might still survive:

But, allowing, for a moment, that, in some cases, the legislature might be justified in such an unguarded delegation of its trust, the conduct of the Dublin Society, at least, has been such, as to deprive it of every claim to public confidence. The evidence, now before the public, presents such a constant scene of mismanagement, in every department, and at every period, in which its proceedings could be ascertained, that, to continue to repose confidence in such a body, would be beyond the stretch even of Tory favouritism. Nor is this all. The same evidence contains such flagrant instances of misrepresentation and contradiction, as to render whatever is favourable to the Society, not merely suspicious, but absolutely inadmissible. To give one or two instances only:—Mr. Isaac Wild, in his evidence on the Leskean collection of minerals, says, that its arrangement has remained unaltered, from the time of its purchase, in 1792, as a memorial of the state of mineralogical knowledge at that time;

and that, under such arrangement, it cannot fail to be of very great use to students, in the present improved state of the science. On the other hand, Mr. Richard Griffith, the ex-professor of mineralogy, when questioned on the same subject, states, that the collection has been so disarranged, that it would be difficult for students to find out the places of the minerals, as marked in the catalogue; and he winds up his evidence on this head, with the following emphatic declaration:—

“ Q. Then the intention of the Leskean collection is by no means attended to by the Society, although they so religiously keep up the arrangement *nominally* ?

“ A. I admit that to the fullest extent.”

Again, in a letter or memorial, addressed to the Irish government, for the purpose of obtaining an addition to the annual grant, to be employed in enlarging the buildings, the Society is made to say, that its “ extensive museums are stored with objects illustrative of nature, science, and art; that the establishment is not merely resorted to by the youth of Ireland, but by the numerous students, who, since Dublin has acquired celebrity, by the excellence and cheapness of its anatomical schools, annually arrive from England, Scotland, and from the British colonies and dependencies.”—That, “ with respect to the museum, it contains collections in the several departments of natural history, and an interesting assemblage of antiquities, and works of art, and, *in particular*, it contains a large collection, every day encreasing, of the mineralogical productions of Ireland.”

Now, it is only necessary to refer to the evidence of the Society's own selected witnesses, to be convinced of the gross exaggeration contained in these official statements, made, it must be observed, for the purpose of prevailing on the government to sanction the application for an increased grant of money,—statements, in which the deviations from truth rise above each other in a regular climax, topped by the daring panegyric on that same mineralogical collection, so emphatically denounced by one of its own witnesses, as “ a disgrace to the Society.”

The truth is, the whole thing has been a job from beginning to end—from the moment of its conception, in the brain of its original deviser, to the present hour. The *ostensible* object of the Society was, to increase the comforts and happiness of the Irish people, by the extension of their agricultural and manufacturing resources; the *real* object was, without relaxing the severity of the penal code, to secure to the landed gentry an increased amount of rent, tithe, and local taxes, all of which ultimately lodged themselves in the pockets of the aristocracy. But this

object has failed. The people, instead of suffering themselves to be trampled into subserviency, have struggled incessantly against the pressure, and have at length shaken it off. The crisis of 1829, brought about by the agency of a man, with whom the boast of Pericles would be no exaggeration, taught them to feel and to respect their own power. They can now stand erect before their oppressors: and though the contest is not yet over, though much, perhaps, of individual suffering remains to be endured, the victory and the triumph cannot long be delayed. This the Society feels: and accordingly, its aspirations are now limited to the humbler task, of providing a comfortable retirement for itself. Even the medals and the trumpery are abandoned: the only ambition of the managers is confined to the improvement of their residence, and the enlargement of their buildings, where their wives and their daughters may listen to lectures adapted to the calibre of their intellectual organization; may walk round the museums and galleries, in wet weather, to show their country cousins the butterflies, and the Lapland hut, and the colossal elk; and on sunshiny days, may expatiate on the lawn, with the exhilarating reflection, that the country annually pays a hundred and fifty pounds an acre, for their exclusive gratification. This is the humble limit of the job at present. The Society, indeed, protests against such a conclusion. The managers ask, through the mouths of their own witnesses, have we not professors, and schools, and a botanical garden, and a statue gallery, and a museum?—To be sure they have. There must be something to show, in return for what they have received,—something to afford the Chancellor of the Exchequer a decent pretence for pouring the public money into their lap. They have, indeed, professors, or more properly lecturers, with scanty salaries, and not less scanty abilities: they have a library without readers, save only among the favoured: they have lectures without hearers, save only among the triflers, who would lounge away an hour before dinner, and obtain a topic of conversation for the evening. They have, moreover, a museum, where there is neither room for the specimens, nor specimens for the room: and above all, they have a botanical garden, of which, they exultingly declare, the citizens of Dublin may be justly proud!—"Justly proud," indeed! A stranger asks what has been done for the country, and the Society glibly replies,—“Look to our botanic garden, its size and beauty”! We say in return—Look to the people; look to their raggedness and destitution: and when the peasant’s cottage and potatoe plot shall be what they ought, it will be time enough to talk of spacious grounds, and beautiful gardens, for the citizens of Dublin. But, to look at the matter in another light:—how

comes it that every other city and town in the empire, ambitious of improvement in the study of nature, can maintain a botanical garden out of its own unaided resources, while that of the Dublin Society, supported by large grants of public money, and still acknowledged to be far inferior, in scientific value, to the neighbouring garden of Trinity College, pleads poverty, and calls for enlarged means to make it respond to public expectation? Edinburgh has its botanic garden: so has Liverpool, Belfast, and Manchester. Who pays for these?—Not the public. The members subscribe, and the institution is creditably and economically managed.

In short, we repeat it, Parliament, which ought to have shewn itself the rigid guardian of the public purse, had no right, in the first instance, to delegate its power, to transfer its responsibility, except to agents appointed by itself, acting under its immediate inspection, and subject to the consequences of negligence and malversation. It had no right to delegate its trust to any irresponsible body, and much less to one which has proved itself so reckless—to adopt no harsher term—in the expenditure of its funds; which, after lavishing upwards of three hundred thousand pounds, in the space of thirty years, has nothing but a botanic garden, and a pile of useless buildings to produce; and which, on being called upon, at the eleventh hour, for an account of its stewardship, has recourse to the most disreputable arts, in order to make out some kind of a bill of particulars. But, if the corrupt Parliaments of former times could thus betray the interests of the people, can we believe that the reformed legislature of the present day will continue to sanction the misdoings of its predecessors? If we know the spirit of the present House of Commons, we say emphatically that it will *not*. The recommendations of the Committee may be impotent, or otherwise; but the evidence, which formed its groundwork, remains: and it is the duty of the government to take it into immediate consideration. Let Parliament, then, look to this. Let it withdraw its patronage from a Society, where everything is loss to the public, and everything gain to the members. Let it exert its energies in behalf of Ireland, unmoved by the clamours and by the interests of those who have been living only for themselves; and the regeneration of the country, and the prosperity and the happiness of her people, will not be far distant.

---

- ART. XII.—1. *The Vespers of Palermo.* A Tragedy, in Five Acts.
2. *The Siege of Valencia.* A Dramatic Poem. By Felicia Hemans. London. 1823.
3. *The Forest Sanctuary, with Lays of Many Lands.* By Felicia Hemans. London.
4. *Records of Woman, with other Poems.* By Felicia Hemans. Edinburgh. 1828.
5. *Scenes and Hymns of Life, with other religious Poems.* By Felicia Hemans. Edinburgh. 1834.
6. *Poetical Remains of the late Mrs. Hemans.* Edinburgh. 1836.
7. *Memorials of Mrs. Hemans, with Illustrations of her Literary Character, from her Private Correspondence.* By Henry F. Chorley. 2 vols. London. 1836.

THERE is a general complaint amongst the children of song, that the taste for poetry is on the decline amongst us; and there is something like a disposition to fear, that, amid the progress of utilitarian objects, there is danger of its total extinction in the land. If the question, thus raised, were to be decided by the degree of attention which the bard of our day is enabled to command for his inspirations, as compared with the enthusiasm which hailed the songs of his brethren twenty years ago, there would certainly be some reason for these gloomy anticipations. But the poet should be the last to despair of the indefeasible ascendancy, and final triumphs, of his art. A more philosophical view of the matter will assuredly convince him, that there is nothing, in the immediate neglect under which it lies, whence any inference is to be drawn as to its ultimate decline. Its outward fortunes, like those of everything whose manifestations make their appeal to the public taste, must be subject to the fluctuations of the national mind; but its essential influence, as an interpreter of all the natural and moral aspects of the world, and as speaking to the universal passions of the human breast, has a sway as old, and must have one as enduring, as nature and passion themselves. The history of the art in all times, and wherever it can be distinctly traced, exhibits, like that of all other moral and natural powers, a series of sleeps and awakenings, replacing each other in the necessary sequence of action and reaction; and presents examples of its revivification from trances so long and death-like, as to make all future despondency on the subject of its fate idle and unphilosophic. It is abundantly evident, that the taste for poetry is but in one of those natural and temporary lulls, which

form the alternate state of its prolonged existence; and that its present repose is, at once, the necessary consequence of its past activity, and the certain pledge of its vigorous restoration.

Besides this natural succession of action and repose, and not altogether unconnected with it, there are causes more material and tangible,\* which help on the progress, to the one, or to the other, state of the public mind, when once it has taken either direction. Connected with the advancing tide of poetic feeling, sometimes *occasioning* its returning flow, at others availing themselves thereof, but, in every case, assisting its progress, are always to be found the names of certain masters of the lyre, which float upon its waters, and are speedily identified with its spreading flood in the public mind. These bards become the idols of the newly awakened passion for their art; they come, in fact, to represent the art itself to the age, whose more immediate introduction to it was in connection with their song; and, as the national mind has only room for a certain number of idols at a time, it happens that others, whose names have risen only on the later waves, though with harps and tones as rich as those which have already engaged the public ear, are left to pour their music unheeded and unrewarded by the world. The consequence of this is evident. The silencing of those voices, which have monopolized the national enthusiasm, is followed by the decay of that enthusiasm itself: the passing away of the names which have been the representatives of the art, is taken for the departure of the art itself. The natural tendency of the overstrained mind to re-action, receives its accelerating impulses from this cause; and the ebb of poetical feeling, under its influence, is in direct ratio with the energy and height of its previous flow. Something like this is the present condition of the national mind on the subject of poetry; and something like these are the causes by which it has been brought about. The great masters of song, who poured the tide of poetic feeling over the land, some twenty years ago, have for the most part disappeared, and left it to its re-action; whilst of those who remain to touch their harps amid its ebb, there are some who still sing occasionally, as if to show how much of their fame they owe to the circumstances of their first appearance, and how surely other bards would have worn a portion of their laurels, had they contended for them in an equal field. It would be invidious, because not necessary to our purpose, here to point to the particular instances which illustrate this position. They will no doubt readily suggest themselves to our readers. But, in the meantime, it may be observed, in behalf of the public on the one side, that the fact of there being bards who can win attention to their song, under circumstances the most unfavourable, proves how inde-

structible is the principle of poetic taste in the educated breast; and, in behalf of the bard on the other, that he, who, in the age of poetical enthusiasm, can make himself heard, amid the strains of his rivals, or, in the day of apathy, can gain an audience at all, must be possessed of the true spell to which that principle is ever destined to answer. Both these triumphs have been effected by the lady, whose name we have placed at the head of our article; and it is on this ground, therefore, that we propose to enquire into the nature and extent of her power as a poetess, and, at the same time, to examine how far it was exercised in a manner likely to extend its influence to posterity.

But, before we conclude our remarks upon the error which looks despondingly on the fortunes of the lyre, we may observe that there is much in the circumstances of the present time to render it unpoetical, or, at least, to account for its indifference to the voices, by which poetry speaks. In the most palmy and propitious days of the art, the enthusiasm for its inspirations, is chiefly confined to the young or the idle—to the young who have not yet learnt that the world has harsh realities, which must be met; or the idle, whom fortune has placed apart from its struggles. He who is busily engaged in the contests of life, has little time for the indulgences of the imagination. If his love for the muses leads him occasionally to their springs, it is that he may gather strength for the performance of the sterner duties which await him. But he has no leisure for exploring those dim and luxurious recesses, or wandering amid those haunted gardens and enchanted palaces which woo the spirits of the imaginative and unemployed. It is with nations as with individuals; and with the former, times of social disturbance, or of moral transition, have never been favourable to the manifestations of the muse. The troubled periods of history are, no doubt, those, in which the energies have been awakened and the powers fostered, to which poetry subsequently, and, in calmer moments, makes her most successful appeals. It was at the close of the long struggle against Persian invasion, and under the influence of the energies, which had grown almost divine in the progress of that great contest, that poetry in Greece spoke out, at once, with all her voices, of painting, sculpture, philosophy, eloquence, and song. The protracted silence of the muse in England, during the struggles of the Roses, was broken by the minstrels, who filled the land with song, in the days of Elizabeth: and it was not till the termination of the civil war, in the following century, that Milton employed those powers, which had sought sterner and less worthy occupation, during its continuance. The remark is of universal application, and bears directly on the circumstances of our own



day. If the present age has not been one of strife, it has, at least, been a period of engrossing interest for the national mind. Great questions, affecting the destinies of large sections of the human race, have kept men's thoughts in a state of breathless attention, which left them no leisure for any occupations less important than the examination of the vast issues on which they were fixed. Many of these questions have already received a wise solution; and men begin to repose confidently on the principles, which have governed their decision, for the rest. There is much to do still; but a period of rest is visibly and certainly approaching—and that, too, under the shelter of a state of things, which includes little less than a social and political regeneration. New hopes and new feelings are preparing magnificent materials for the bard; and this unmusical and preoccupied age is bringing us to the threshold of a time when poetry is likely to speak a language as glowing and triumphant as heretofore; when enlarged prospects and expanded humanities will supply the theme, and the minstrel will find an audience as attentive and as eager, as renewed spirits and freshened sympathies can create.

It is to the causes to which we have here adverted, rather, perhaps, than to any special inclination in the genius of the writers themselves, that we must attribute the particular form under which the great body of our recent poetry has appeared. In the absence of that encouragement, which gave birth to poetical ventures of greater length, amongst their predecessors, the modern aspirants to the honours of the muse have been content to support their titles by efforts of less pretension; and the public, which would have set its face against more imposing displays of the art, has been won to listen to snatches of song, which, while they charmed by their sweetness, made no great demand upon its time and attention. A larger proportion of the verse of the day has, in obedience to the necessities of the case, assumed the lyric shape, and insinuated itself into notice, in the pages of one or other of the periodical publications. Much even of the popularity of Mrs. Hemans was won in the pages of these fostering volumes; and it was the popularity so obtained which enabled her subsequently to dispense with their aid, and come before the world in her own unassisted strength.

To a review of the poetical character of Mrs. Hemans, we are led by more than one consideration. With the single exception of Joanna Baillie, she is, perhaps, the only poetess of the day, who has established a chance of being heard; beyond the narrow circle of her contemporary flatterers. She has a right, therefore, to our attention: and though we have no design to inquire into the causes of the numerous poetical failures, to which female genius has

been subjected, we deem it right, if possible, to ascertain the precise nature of her qualifications, and to point out the peculiar merits, by which she has been recommended to the notice of her countrymen.

But, besides this, we are anxious to rescue the fame of Mrs. Hemans from the obloquy cast on it, by the unfortunate publication which stands the seventh, at the head of this article. It purports to furnish memorials of that gifted lady, and illustrations of her literary character. The title, however, is an entire misnomer:—the book is written solely for the illustration of Mr. Henry Chorley himself; and includes, amongst its other contributions to that object, an absolute sacrifice of the interests of the poetess, in whose service he would be thought to have enlisted. What may be the feelings of the surviving relatives of the deceased, at the publication of this book, we pretend not to know: but, for ourselves, we must acknowledge, that we have risen from its perusal with such a sense of indignation at its vain and gossiping details, that we can scarcely bring ourselves to speak of them in terms of ordinary patience. Why was the world to be told of a correspondence, which, to name its least objectionable characteristic, is little better than the tattle of a pair of sentimental milliners? Could not Mr. Chorley's vanity be illustrated by a more harmless process, could not his admission to the literary coteries be effected at a less cost, than the depreciation which Mrs. Hemans has been doomed to suffer at his hands?

There were many incidents in the life of Mrs. Hemans, which contributed to make her lot other than fortunate: amongst them all, there was none, perhaps, which may be regarded as so peculiarly unhappy, as the kind of association into which she appears to have been thrown, during her residence in the neighbourhood of Liverpool. For all the other evils of her destiny, her gift of song, and the fame, which was its high reward, brought something like a compensation; while the grave itself, which has since closed over her, afforded her, at length, a final refuge from their power. But *this* evil was one, which struck at those very gifts, and that very fame, which were her comforters under all her sorrows:—nay, through the medium of the publication in question, it has even been made to survive herself, and follow her with its depreciating influence beyond the tomb!

Our own impression, on the perusal of these records, was, that the character of Mrs. Hemans' mind, as displayed in her writings, had been estimated too highly. We thought it impossible to reconcile the existence of such exalted powers with the evidence which was now placed before us; and we resolved, therefore, to satisfy our doubts, and decide the question, by a re-perusal

of her works. If the result has failed to remove the difficulty, suggested by Mr. Chorley's records, it has, at least, established the fair writer in the supremacy of her intellectual powers. We can now appeal in her behalf, from her biographer to herself: we can place, against the evidence of Mr. Chorley's book, the evidence of her own books; and can thus rescue the general memory of the illustrious dead from the shadow flung upon it by these foolish records of a few foolish years.

Felicia Dorothea Browne, was born in Liverpool, on the 25th of September 1794, according to Mr. Chorley, but, according to another of her biographers, in 1793. Her father was a merchant, at one time, of some eminence; and her mother, whose family name was Wagner, though a German by birth, was of Italian descent. It is upon the strength of this fact, that Mr. Chorley has chosen to favour us with some vague and apocryphal statements regarding the pedigree of this same Miss Wagner, whose ancestral tree is said to have borne, at some uncertain periods, no less than three Doges. We have no authority to contradict this statement: but we have had some personal means of making acquaintance with the circumstances of Mrs. Hemans' history, and we must acknowledge, that we now hear of her "high lineage" for the first time. Of course, however, it is serviceable to Mr. Chorley's peculiar view of his subject. He talks about the influence of what he calls the *force du sang*; he speaks of the probability of her poetical temperament having been derived from her Italian origin; and he concludes by referring us generally to a foreign descent, for "that remarkable instinct towards the beautiful, which rarely forms so prominent a feature in the character of one wholly English born." We have no doubt that this will form a text of great authority amongst the milliners' apprentices; and as little that any of our poetesses, who may hereafter be looking for immortality at the hands of Mr. Chorley, will take especial care to find a Venetian Doge, or at the very least, a Neapolitan Bandit, lurking somewhere or other amongst the branches of their family trees. What, however, appears to us to have been of far more consequence, both in itself, and in its influence on the mind of the future poetess, is, that her mother was a woman richly endowed with virtues and accomplishments; and that she applied them to the instruction of her daughter, under circumstances the most favourable to the developement of her fine natural powers.

Some unfortunate speculations, during the precarious period of the French Revolution, having broken up the commercial fortunes of her father, he retired with his family, at an early period of his gifted daughter's life, into North Wales. Here, in

“a solitary, old, and spacious mansion, lying close to the sea-shore, and in front shut in by a chain of rocky hills,” we should have thought that, without travelling to Italy for the purpose, Mr. Chorley might have found the origin of “that strong tinge of romance which,” according to him, “from infancy pervaded every thought, word, and aspiration of her daily life:”—and here too, under the care of that admirable mother, of whose high fitness for the task, Mrs. Hemans is not the only daughter that has furnished evidence, the powers of her intellect were unfolded, and the vigour of her fancy grew. There was nothing remarkable in her youth; although Mr. Chorley fills his narrative with those common-places of biography, by which, with a view to confer a spurious interest on those who need no such appliance, persons who achieve distinction in after-life, are subsequently discovered to have been very wonderful children. Thus, we are informed that Mrs. Hemans had, in youth, a very strong memory,—a circumstance by no means sufficiently remarkable in childhood, to erect her into a prodigy. Then, again, we are told that having early discovered a taste for poetry (no uncommon thing either), she used to climb into an apple-tree, for the purpose of reading Shakspeare! Finally, we have anecdotes of such value as the following:—“One gentleman, who took a kind and efficient interest in the publication of her earliest poems, talked so much, and so warmly, about her, that his sister used to say—‘Brother, you must be in love with that girl!’—to which he would answer,—‘If I were twenty years younger, I would marry her!’” And again, there is a small piece of the sentimental, executed by a lady, who must have been not only remarkably fine, but also remarkably foolish; and who is reported to have said, in the hearing of the little Felicia,—“That child is not made for happiness, I know; *her colour comes and goes too fast*”!

All this is very sorry and very sickly stuff, not worth relating, if it were true, leading to no possible conclusion, and proving nothing but the frivolity of the mind that could occupy itself in its collection. Indeed, Mr. Chorley himself seems to have been aware of his own weakness. Like Dangle, in the “*Critic*,” he evidently labours under a suspicion that we may have “heard something like this before:” and accordingly, he endeavours to astonish us with an anecdote, which, at least, possesses the merit of being uncommon:—“The sea-shore,” says the biographer, “was her Forest of Ardenne; and she loved its loneliness and freedom well: *it was a favorite freak of her’s, WHEN QUITE A CHILD, to get up privately, after the careful attendants had fancied her safe in bed, and making her way down to the water-side, to indulge herself with a stolen*

*bath ! !*" Truly, *this* anecdote, if authenticated, would be original indeed !—though even then, we think, that, as an illustration of character, it would have had a better effect, if introduced amongst the childish memorials of some future admiral, or circumnavigator. As it is, however, we suspect that somebody has been mystifying our author. .

The reader will scarcely wonder, if we pause, for a moment, to remark Mr. Chorley's statements, relative to the uncommon beauty of his heroine. Mrs. Hemans was never beautiful. We have the best authority for asserting, that she had, at no time, any beauty, beyond that of youth ; and in later years she certainly was extremely plain. How Mr. Chorley can have been induced to venture upon this subject, we are at a loss to imagine. To the illustration of Mrs. Hemans' fame such statements must necessarily be useless : to the reputation of the writer himself they must be positively injurious. They must impeach his judgment as a critic, and cast suspicion on his fidelity as a biographer. — But to return to Mrs. Hemans.

That, which *was* remarkable in the progress of this lady's youth, manifested itself at a later period, than that to which our author has referred. Charmed, undoubtedly, at an early age, with the productions of the muse, her "prevailing love of poetry" (we quote from a sensible and well-written memoir prefixed to the published volume of her "Remains") "soon naturally turned to a cultivation of the art, in her own person ; and a volume of verses, written by her, when she was not yet eleven years old, attracted, from that circumstance, as well as from its intrinsic merit, no inconsiderable share of public attention. This little volume was, in the course of the four succeeding years, followed by two others, which evinced powers gradually but steadily expanding, and which were received with increasing fervour by the admirers of poetry."

The fact, however, is, that these volumes were of little value, excepting for the indications which they contained, of immature powers, from whose ripenings much was to be expected. The fulfilment of the promise which they exhibited was, however, postponed by events, of which we know little ; but which, nevertheless, exercised the most powerful influence over the future fortunes, as well as mind, of the poetess. Her marriage with Captain Hemans, of the 4th regiment, a gentleman of the most respectable connexions, took place in her nineteenth year ; and was followed a few years afterwards, and shortly before the birth of a fifth son, by a separation, which proved to be final, as regards this world. Of the causes, which led to this unhappy result, nothing is certainly known. Those which are generally assigned,

are inadequate to explain it ; and we may, therefore, presume, that the true ones involved feelings, which the parties interested had no disposition to parade before the world. If Mr. Chorley possesses the means of enlightening the curious on this subject, we give him all credit for the good taste which has induced him to be silent ; and could only wish that it had been equally effectual in leading him to still farther suppressions. Certain it is, however, that this breaking up of those fortunes, which, under almost any circumstances, form the happiest destiny of woman—this unnatural widowhood to which she was condemned, not only communicated its tone of regret to her spirit, and murmur to her song, but has more than once, we think, been distinctly pointed out in some of the more tender passages of her poetry. Thus, in those snatches of Corinne-like song, which we meet with in Properzia Rossi, it is impossible not to believe, that her own history and feelings are shadowed out. Rossi was a celebrated female sculptor and poet, of Bologna, who is said to have died of an unrequited attachment, after the completion of her last work, a *basso-relievo* of Ariadne.

“ It comes,—the power

Within me born, flows back ; my fruitless dower  
That could not win me love. Yet once again  
I greet it proudly, with its rushing train  
Of glorious images : they throng—they press—  
A sudden joy lights up my loneliness,—  
I shall not perish, all !

The bright work grows

Beneath my hand, unfolding, as a rose,  
Leaf after leaf to beauty ; line by line,  
I fix my thought, heart, soul, to burn, to shine,  
Thro' the pale marble's veins. It grows—and now  
I give my own life's history to thy brow,  
Forsaken Ariadne ! thou shalt wear  
My form, my linaments ; but oh ! more fair,  
Touched into lovelier being by the glow  
Which in me dwells, as by the summer light  
All things are glorified. From thee my woe  
Shall yet look beautiful to meet his sight,  
When I am passed away. Thou art the mould  
Wherein I pour the fervent thoughts, the untold,  
The self-consuming ! Speak to him of me,  
Thou, the deserted by the lonely sea,  
With the soft sadness of thine earnest eye,—  
Speak to him, lorn one ! deeply, mournfully,  
Of all my love and grief ! Oh ! could I throw  
Into thy frame a voice,—a sweet, and low,  
And thrilling voice of song ! when he came nigh,  
To send the passion of its melody

Through his pierced bosom—on its tones to bear  
 My life's deep feeling, as the southern air  
 Wafts the faint myrtle's breath,—to rise, to swell,  
 To sink away in accents of farewell,  
 Winning but one, *one* gush of tears, whose flow  
 Surely my parted spirit yet might know,  
 If love be strong as death.

How fair thou art,  
 Thou form whose life is of my burning heart !  
 Yet all the vision that within me wrought  
 I cannot make thee ! Oh ! I might have given  
 Birth to creations of far nobler thought ;  
 I might have kindled with the fire of heaven  
 Things not of such as die ! But I have been  
 Too much alone :—a heart whereon to lean,  
 With all these deep affections, that o'erflow  
 My aching soul, and find no shore below,—  
 An eye to be my star,—a voice to bring  
 Hope o'er my path, like sounds that breathe of spring ;—  
 These are denied me—dreamt of still in vain ;  
 Therefore my brief aspirings from the chain  
 Are ever but as some wild, fitful song,  
 Rising triumphantly, to die ere long  
 In dirge-like echoes.

Yet the world will see  
 Little of this, my parting work, in thee.  
 Thou shalt have fame !—Oh, mockery ! give the reed  
 From storms a shelter,—give the drooping vine  
 Something round which its tendrils may entwine,—  
 Give the parched flower a rain-drop,—and the meed  
 Of love's kind words to woman ! Worthless fame !  
 That in *his* bosom wins not for my name  
 The abiding-place it asked ! Yet how my heart,  
 In its own fairy world of song and art,  
 Once beat for praise !"

And again :—

" Where'er I move  
 The shadow of this broken-hearted love  
 Is on me and around. Too well *they* know  
 Whose life is all within—too soon and well,  
 When there the blight hath settled ! But I go  
 Under the silent wings of peace to dwell ;  
 From the slow wasting, from the lonely pain,  
 The inward burning of those words—" *in vain* "—  
 Seared on the heart, I go. 'Twill soon be past.  
 Sunshine and song, and bright Italian heaven,  
 And thou—oh ! thou, on whom my spirit cast  
 Unvalued wealth—who knowest not what was given

In that devotedness—the sad, and deep,  
And unrepaid—farewell ! If I could weep  
Once, only once, belov'd one, on thy breast,  
Pouring my heart forth ere I sink to rest !  
But *that* were happiness ; and unto me  
Earth's gift is *fame*. Yet I was form'd to be  
So richly blest ! With thee to watch the sky,  
Speaking not—feeling but that thou wert nigh ;  
With thee to listen, while the tones of song  
Swept, even as part of our sweet air, along,—  
To listen silently ;—with thee to gaze  
On forms, the deified of olden days,  
This had been joy enough ; and, hour by hour,  
From its glad well-springs drinking life and power,  
How had my spirit soared, and made its fame  
A glory for thy brow ! Dreams—dreams !—the fire  
Burns faint within me. Yet I leave my name,  
As a deep thrill may linger on the lyre,  
When its full cords are hushed—awhile to live,  
And, one day, haply in thy heart revive  
Sad thoughts of me :—I leave it with a sound,  
A spell o'er memory, mournfully profound,  
I leave it on my country's air to dwell,—  
Say proudly yet—' *'twas hers, who loved me well !* ' ”

After her separation from her husband, Mrs. Hemans continued to reside with her mother and sister, at a quiet and secluded spot, in the neighbourhood of St. Asaph. Here it was that her powers grew to their full stature, and her mind, busied in laying up its store of acquirements, prepared itself for those magnificent efforts, by which it was afterwards distinguished. It was in this neighbourhood that the expanding tone and compass of her minstrelsy first waylaid the attention of such spirits as Byron and Shelley: it was here that she won the friendship of Milman and Reginald Heber; and it is to this spot, therefore, that we would point for testimonials to her genius, which are worth all the unmeaning anecdotes that Mr. Chorley has given to the world.

The life of Mrs. Hemans, subsequently to the termination of its wedded years, seems to divide itself into three distinct and unequal portions; the first, the longest and by far the most important, includes the remainder of her residence in North Wales; the second embraces the period which she passed in the neighbourhood of Liverpool; and the third extends over that, during which she was restored to the association of her own family in Ireland. The rapid developement of her mind, during the earliest of these periods, is well supposed by Mr. Chorley to have been promoted by



those peculiar circumstances of her position, which, "by placing her in a household as a member, and not as its head, excused her from many of those small cares of domestic life, which might have fretted away her day-dreams, and by interruption, have made of less avail the search for knowledge to which she bent herself with such eagerness." During this period it was, that she poured forth in rapid succession, the largest and by far the most valuable body of her poetry, beginning with her prize poems of "Wallace" and "Dartmoor," some not very able translations from Camoens and others, and "The Restoration of the Works of Art to Italy;" and including the "Tales and Historic Scenes," "The Sceptic," "Modern Greece," "The Vespers of Palermo," "The Welsh Melodies," "The Siege of Valencia," "The Forest Sanctuary," "The Records of Woman," and above all, the best and greatest portion of those fine detached lyrics, which, having separately contributed to float her up to the height of her popularity, upon their swelling music, have since been collected under various titles, such as "Lays of Many Lands," "Songs of the Affections," &c. Here then is the place to pause, and before we proceed to the less pleasing task of examining that portion of her history which forms the principal material of Mr. Chorley's volumes, to make some enquiry into the character of her genius, and its claims on the admiration of posterity.

From this enquiry, we will at once discharge the earliest of the poems which we have mentioned; because they are, as Mr. Chorley observes, the produce of the transition state of her mind; and, standing, as she does, for judgment, at the bar of posterity, she has a right to be tried by the best of her productions, and the fruits of her matured powers. "Her first works," he correctly remarks, "are purely classical, or purely romantic: they may be compared to antique groups of sculpture, or the mailed ornamental figures of the middle ages set in motion. As she advanced on her way, sadly learning, the while, the grave lessons which time and trial teach, her songs breathed more of reality, and less of romance; the too exclusive and feverish reverence for high intellectual or imaginative endowment, yielded to a calmness, and a cheerfulness, and a willingness, more and more, not merely to speculate upon, but to partake of, the beauty in our daily paths."

It has been remarked, we believe by Mrs. Jameson, that "the poetry of Mrs. Hemans could only have been written by a woman;"—and although this is undoubtedly true, yet it is not less certain, that there is something wanted in it, which might most confidently have been looked for from a woman's muse.

The prominent qualities of Mrs. Hemans' poetical writings,

are, a versification whose varied melody has scarcely been surpassed, a splendour of general diction,—whose pomp has occasionally been employed to conceal a poverty of thought,—and a frequent grace and picturesqueness of particular expression, which enrich it with the continual and unexpected claim of a *curiosa felicitas*. These, with an unlimited command of glowing imagery, an unfailing taste in its appropriation, extreme elegance of thought, and a fine perception of the tenderness of others, have contributed to conceal, from many of her admirers, the somewhat inconsistent fact, that Mrs. Hemans is, herself, deficient in tenderness. Near as she appears to have sometimes approached to it, it is, nevertheless, true, that she has nowhere, or very rarely, stirred the fountain of tears; and it is as true, that, notwithstanding an air of mournful philosophy breathed over her poetry, she has seldom sounded the “deeper deeps” of the spirit. The thoughts, with which her muse is most conversant, lie near the surface of a poetical mind like hers. Her pictures of passion want vitality, and appear rather to be sketched from the traditions of the intellect, than drawn from the deep feelings of a woman’s heart. Often as the ear is agreeably startled by graceful expression in her gem-like verse, yet it is scarcely ever surprised with any of those lines, which it at once transfers to the heart, to be a part of its treasury for ever. The grace of simplicity is one, which she has rarely reached,—one which she seldom even aimed at till later in life, when it failed her. It was not of the nature of her genius; and its want, united with the other characteristics which we have mentioned, contributed, in no inconsiderable degree, to produce that monotony, whereby her poetry is so unpleasantly distinguished.

But there is another cause for this monotony, arising from a defect in her philosophy; and this, also, she tried to correct in later life, and with better success. It consists in her tendency to draw from every subject, which she selects for her muse, its gloomier moral. The futility and mortality of all things furnish her constant theme: her notions of the poetical, indeed, seem, for a long time, to have been limited to these objects. She could not select such a topic as that of Bruce’s triumphant feelings, beside the long-sought springs of the Nile, save for the purpose of describing the revulsion that came over him, as he thought of the weary space which he had traversed to find these little fountains, and the long distance and many dangers, which still reared themselves between him and his home. She surrounds a subject with all its external pomps, and adorns it with a robe of gorgeous imagery, that she may afterwards pluck out the dark heart of its mystery, in mockery of its pride. All the beauty, that spring

confers upon the natural world, is contrasted with all the desolation which it too often brings to the heart. This, it is true, is frequently done for a high moral object, and in a gush of song which makes it incumbent upon us to furnish some of our evidences of her genius, from this class of subjects. But our complaint is, that it runs through her poetry, as its prevailing moral characteristic. "Vanity of vanities!"—"all is vanity!"—makes the perpetually recurring burthen of her song. We will quote:—

"THE REVELLERS.

"RING, joyous chords! ring out again!  
 A swifter still, and a wilder strain!  
 They are here—the fair face and the careless heart,  
 And stars shall wane ere the mirthful part.  
 —But I met a dimly mournful glance,  
 In a sudden turn of the flying dance!  
 I heard the tone of a heavy sigh,  
 In a pause of the thrilling melody!  
 And it is not well that woe should breathe  
 On the bright spring-flowers of the festal wreath.  
 —Ye that to thought or to grief belong,  
 Leave—leave the hall of song!

"Ring, joyous chords!—but who art *thou*,  
 With the shadowy locks o'er thy pale young brow,  
 And the world of dreamy gloom that lies  
 In the misty depths of thy soft dark eyes?  
 —Thou hast loved, fair girl! thou hast loved too well!  
 Thou art mourning now o'er a broken spell;  
 Thou hast poured thy heart's rich treasures forth,  
 And art unrepaid for their priceless worth!  
 Mourn on; yet come thou not *here* the while,  
 It is but a pain to see thee smile!  
 There is not a tone in our songs for thee—  
 Home, with thy sorrows, flee!

Ring, joyous chords! ring out again!  
 —But what dost *thou* with the revel's train?  
 A silvery voice through the soft air floats,  
 But thou hast no part in the gladdening notes;  
 There are bright young faces that pass thee by,  
 But they fix no glance of thy wandering eye!  
 Away! there's a void in thy yearning breast,  
 Thou weary man! wilt thou *here* find rest?  
 Away! for thy thoughts from the scene have fled,  
 And the love of *thy* spirit is with the dead!  
 Thou art but more lone midst the sounds of mirth—  
 Back to thy silent hearth!

“Ring, joyous chords! ring forth again!  
A swifter still, and a wilder strain!  
—But *thou*, though a reckless mien be thine,  
And thy cup be crowned with the foaming wine,  
By the fitful bursts of thy laughter loud,  
By thine eye’s quick flash through its troubled, cloud,  
I know thee! it is but the wakeful fear  
Of a haunted bosom that brings thee here!  
I know thee!—thou fearest the solemn night,  
With her piercing stars, and her deep wind’s might!  
There’s a tone in her voice which thou fain would’st shun,  
For it asks what the secret soul hath done!  
And thou—there’s a dark weight on thine—away!  
—Back to thy home, and pray!

“Ring, joyous chords! ring out, again!  
A swifter still, and a wilder strain!  
And bring fresh wreaths!—we will banish all  
Save the free in heart from our festive hall!  
On through the maze of the fleet dance, on!  
—But where are the young and the lovely?—gone!  
Where are the brows with the red rose crowned,  
And the floating forms with the bright zone bound?  
And the waving locks and the flying feet,  
That still should be where the mirthful meet!  
—They are gone—they are fled—they are parted all!  
—Alas! the forsaken hall!”

We must give one more splendid example from this class of her poetry,—only premising, that the sadness of the earthly morals, which it embodies, being ultimately relieved by the final hope to which they are referred, renders it not the most appropriate example of the manner to which we have been excepting. There are many others, which would have suited our purpose better; but that which we have selected is one of the very finest lyrics which Mrs. Hemans has bequeathed to us; and it moreover gives us an opportunity of pointing out another cause of the monotony which marks this lady’s poetry. That cause is found in a habit of repeating herself, against which she was not sufficiently careful to guard. When a particular train of thought pleased her, she was tempted to return to it, for the purpose of again saying, in a new form, that which had been well said before. The feelings, so finely expounded in the following burst of music, have echoes in at least two several poems, which she wrote at subsequent periods,—one called “Breathings of Spring,” and the other “The Birds of Passage.” The following poem, likewise, furnishes an example of the manner in which some of Mrs. Hemans’s finest lyrics are frequently deprived of much of their

full harmony, by feeble lines, which fall upon the ear with the effect of discord, amid the rich swell of their music, and which a habit of revision might have replaced by more lofty ones.

“ THE VOICE OF SPRING.

- “I come—I come! ye have called me long,  
I come o’er the mountains with light and song!  
Ye may trace my step o’er the wakening earth,  
By the winds that tell of the violet’s birth,  
By the primrose stars in the shadowy grass,  
By the green leaves opening as I pass.
- “I have breathed on the south, and the chestnut flowers  
By thousands have burst from the forest-bowers,  
And the ancient graves and the fallen fanes  
Are veiled with wreaths, on Italian plains;  
—But it is not for me, in my hour of bloom,  
To speak of the ruin or the tomb!
- “I have looked o’er the hills of the stormy north,  
And the larch has hung all his tassels forth;  
The fisher is out on the sunny sea,  
And the rein-deer bounds o’er the pastures free,  
And the pine has a fringe of softer green,  
And the moss looks bright where my foot hath been.
- “I have sent through the wood-paths a glowing sigh,  
And called out each voice of the deep-blue sky;  
From the night-bird’s lay through the starry time,  
In the groves of the soft Hesperian clime,  
To the swan’s wild note, by the Iceland lakes,  
When the dark fir-branch into verdure breaks.
- “From the streams and founts I have loosed the chain,  
They are sweeping on to the silvery main,  
They are flashing down from the mountain brows,  
They are flinging spray o’er the forest-boughs,  
They are bursting fresh from their sparry caves,  
And the earth resounds with the joy of waves!
- “Come forth, O ye children of gladness, come!  
Where the violets lie may be now your home,  
Ye of the rose lip and dew-bright eye,  
And the bounding footstep, to meet me fly!  
With the lyre, and the wreath, and the joyous lay,  
Come forth to the sun—I may not stay.
- “Away from the dwellings of care-worn men,  
The waters are sparkling in grove and glen!  
Away from the chamber and sullen hearth,  
The young leaves are dancing in breezy mirth!  
Their light stems thrill to the wild-wood strains,  
And youth is abroad in my green domains.

“But ye ! ye are changed since ye met me last !  
There is something bright from your features passed !  
There is that come over your brow and eye,  
Which speaks of a world where the flowers must die !  
—Ye smile ! but your smile hath a dimness, yet,—  
Oh ! what have ye looked on since last we met ?

“Ye are changed—ye are changed !—and I see not here,  
All whom I saw in the vanished year ;  
There were graceful heads, with their ringlets bright,  
Which tossed in the breeze with a play of light,  
There were eyes in whose glistening laughter lay  
No faint remembrance of dull decay !

“There were steps that flew o’er the cowslip’s head,  
As if for a banquet all earth were spread ;  
There were voices that rang through the sapphire sky,  
And had not a sound of mortality !  
Are they gone ?—is their mirth from the mountains passed ?  
—Ye have looked on death since ye met me last !

“I know whence the shadow comes o’er you, now,  
Ye have strewn the dust on the sunny brow !  
Ye have given the lovely to earth’s embrace,  
She hath taken the fairest of beauty’s race,  
With their laughing eyes and their festal crown,  
They are gone from amongst you in silence down !

“They are gone from amongst you, the young and fair,  
Ye have lost the gleam of their shining hair !  
—But I know of a land where there falls no blight,  
I shall find them there, with their eyes of light !  
Where death ’midst the blooms of the morn may dwell.  
I tarry no longer ;—farewell—farewell !

“The summer is coming, on soft winds borne,  
Ye may press the grape, ye may bind the corn !  
For me, I depart to a brighter shore,  
Ye are marked by care, ye are mine no more.  
I go where the loved who have left you dwell,  
And the flowers are not Death’s—fare ye well—farewell !”

To the error in her philosophy, of which we have spoken, she seems first to have been awakened by the study of the poetry of Wordsworth—too late, indeed, to communicate to the best of her works the impress of the new wisdom which was stirred within her, but not too late to chasten her spirit by its dictates. The writings of this poet, so full at once of “the still sad music of humanity,” and of the sweet promises and cheerful hopes, which are breathed out of all things, came finally to “haunt her like a

passion;" and, had she made an earlier acquaintance with them, might have had a very salutary effect on her own muse. Her fine lines, beginning—

"There is a strain to read amongst the hills,"

are a worthy tribute of her love and veneration.

There is another peculiarity in the poetry of Mrs. Hemans, at which we have already distantly glanced. We have spoken of her habit of repeating her own thoughts in *separate* poems, and the peculiarity, to which we must now advert, is that of doing the like in the *same* poem. She takes, for example, a single idea for the subject of an entire lyric; and, after developing it, in her first verse, reproduces it in each of the subsequent ones,—taking care, however, to present it with some variations of aspect, and to clothe it in a pomp of words and picturesqueness of illustration, which sometimes succeed in concealing the sameness running through the whole. The poems of this class are very numerous, and some of them, such as "The Songs of our Fathers," "The Spells of Home," &c., are, notwithstanding the generally fine flow of their melody, amongst the weakest of their author's efforts. Others again, such as "The Sunbeam," "The Lost Pleiad," &c. have their monotony awakened into sudden life and grace, by the closing application of some striking moral; while others open to us a scene of surpassing beauty, arising either from the series of pictures which they present, or from the accompaniment of a touching commentary running along the entire piece.

Of the former kind may be mentioned "The Treasures of the Deep"—"The Stranger in Louisiana," and "Bring Flowers;"—amongst the latter, "The Departed," "The Adopted Child," and "The Bird's Release." One of each we will quote, in justification of our remarks. The first is founded on a passage in an early traveller, which mentions a people on the banks of the Mississippi, who burst into tears at the sight of a stranger. "The reason of this is, that they fancy their deceased friends and relations to be only gone on a journey; and, being in constant expectation of their return, look for them vainly amongst these foreign travellers." "J'ai passé, moi-même," says Chateaubriand, in his '*Souvenirs d'Amérique*,' "Chez une peuple de l'Indienne qui se prenait à pleurer à la vue d'un voyageur, parce qu'il lui rappelait des amis partis pour la *Contrée des Ames*, et depuis long-tems en voyage."—It will be seen that the charm of this poem consists in the *one* thought running through the whole, and the rich painting and fine melody of the separate verses.

## " THE STRANGER IN LOUISIANA.

" We saw thee, O stranger, and wept !  
We looked for the youth of the sunny glance,  
Whose step was the fleetest in chace or dance !  
The light of his eye was a joy to see,  
The path of his arrows a storm to flee !  
But there came a voice from a distant shore—  
He was called—he is found 'mid his tribe no more !  
He is not in his place when the night-fires burn,  
But we look for him still—he will yet return !  
— His brother sat, with a drooping brow,  
In the gloom of the shadowing cypress bough,—  
We roused him—we bade him no longer pine,  
For we heard a step—but the step was thine !

" We saw thee, O stranger, and wept !  
We looked for the maid of the mournful song,  
Mournful though sweet—she hath left us long !  
We told her the youth of her love was gone,  
And she went forth to seek him—she passed alone ;  
We hear not her voice when the woods are still,  
From the bower where it sang, like a silvery rill,  
The joy of her Sire with her smile is fled,  
The winter is white on his lonely head ;  
He hath none by his side, when the wilds we track,  
He hath none when we rest—yet she comes not back !  
We looked for her eye on the feast to shine,  
For her breczy step—but the step was thine !

" We saw thee, O stranger, and wept !  
We looked for the chief who hath left the spear  
And the bow of his battles forgotten here !  
We looked for the hunter whose bride's lament  
On the wind of the forest at eve is sent :  
We looked for the first-born, whose mother's cry  
Sounds wild and shrill through the midnight sky !  
— Where are they ?—thou'rt seeking some distant coast—  
Oh ! ask of them, stranger !—send back the lost !  
Tell them we mourn by the dark blue streams,  
Tell them our lives but of them are dreams !  
Tell how we sat in the gloom to pine,  
And to watch for a step—but the step was thine !"

The verses which we shall quote as an example of the other kind, to which we have alluded, in the class of poems containing but one idea, are among the most elegant and finished productions in the entire range of Mrs. Hemans's poetry, and contain but the solitary blemish of the first line in the fourth stanza.



They are based upon a custom which the Indians of Bengal and the coast of Malabar have, of bringing cages, filled with birds, to the graves of their friends, over which they set the birds at liberty. It is called—

“ THE BIRD’S RELEASE.

“ Go forth, for *she* is gone !  
With the golden light of her wavy hair ;  
She is gone to the fields of the viewless air ;  
She hath left her dwelling lone !

“ Her voice hath passed away !  
It hath passed away like a summer breeze,  
When it leaves the hills for the far blue seas,  
Where we may not trace its way.

“ Go forth, and, like her, be free !  
With thy radiant wing and thy glancing eye,  
Thou hast all the range of the sunny sky,  
And what is our grief to thee ?

“ Is it aught ev’n to her we mourn ?  
Doth she look on the tears by her kindred shed ?  
Doth she rest with the flowers o’er her gentle head ;  
Or float on the light wind borne ?

“ We know not—but she is gone !  
Her step from the dance, her voice from the song,  
And the smile of her eye from the festal throng ;—  
She hath left her dwelling lone !

“ When the waves at sunset shine,  
We may hear thy voice, amid thousands more,  
In the scented woods of our glowing shore,  
But we shall not know ’tis thine !

“ Ev’n so with the loved one flown !  
Her smile in the star-light may wander by,  
Her breath may be near in the wind’s low sigh,  
Around us—but all unknown.

“ Go forth, we have loosed thy chain !  
We may deck thy cage with the richest flowers,  
Which the bright day rears in our eastern bowers,  
But thou wilt not be lured again.

“ Ev’n thus may the summer pour  
All fragrant things on the land’s green breast,  
And the glorious earth like a bride be drest,  
But it wins *her* back no more !”

But the harp of Mrs. Hemans, even in its shorter strains, is not confined to the limits of these subjects. It embraces many varieties of tone and topic, and running through "all moods of the lyre," is "master of all." Indeed, on turning over the volumes which contain them, with a view to this article, we have found such an embarrassing multitude, which seem to have the character of undying lays, that we cannot feel any apprehension for her future fame, if it be only from the effect of these detached lyrics. How fine and solemn, and, for once, how appropriately simple, are the sentiments and the music of the following :

" THE TRUMPET.

" The trumpet's voice hath roused the land,  
     Light up the beacon pyre !  
 A hundred hills have seen the brand,  
     And waved the sign of fire.  
 A hundred banners to the breeze  
     Their gorgeous folds have cast—  
 And hark !—was that the sound of seas ?  
     —A king to war went past !

" The chief is arming in his hall,  
     The peasant by his hearth ;  
 The mourner hears the thrilling call,  
     And rises from the earth.  
 The mother on her first-born son  
     Looks with a boding eye—  
*They* come not back, though all be won,  
     Whose young hearts leap so high.

" The bard hath ceased his song, and bound  
     The falchion to his side ;  
 E'en for the marriage-altar crowned,  
     The lover quits his bride.  
 And all this haste, and change, and fear,  
     By *earthly* clarion spread !  
 How will it be when kingdoms hear  
     The blast that wakes the dead ?"

And what can exceed the deep, and religious, and hymn-like beauty of the following ?—

" INVOCATION,

(*Written after the Death of a Sister-in-law.*)

" Answer me, burning stars of night !  
 Where is the spirit gone,  
 That past the reach of human sight,  
     E'en as a breeze hath flown ?

—And the stars answered me—‘ We roll  
In light and power on high,  
But of the never-dying soul  
Ask things that cannot die !’

“ Oh ! many-toned and chainless wind !  
Thou art a wanderer free ;  
Tell me if *thou* its place canst find,  
Far over mount and sea ?  
—And the wind murmured in reply,  
‘ The blue deep I have crost  
And met its banks and billows high,  
But not what thou hast lost !’

“ Ye clouds that gorgeously repose  
Around the setting sun,  
Answer ! have ye a home for those  
Whose earthly race is run ?  
The bright clouds answered—‘ We depart,  
We vanish from the sky ;  
Ask what is deathless in thy heart  
For that which cannot die !’

“ Speak, then, thou voice of God within !  
Thou of the deep, low tone !  
Answer me through life’s restless din,  
Where is the spirit flown ?  
—And the voice answered—‘ Be thou still !  
Enough to know is given ;  
Clouds, winds, and stars *their* task fulfil,  
*Thine* is to trust in heaven !’ ”

The human mind, whatever may be its occupations, will never be without echoes for poetry like this !

But there is one other class of these lyrics on which we must bestow a single word of notice, before we proceed to the examination of Mrs. Hemans’ more elaborate poetry—we mean her chivalric and other ballads. That she should succeed in this style might have been safely predicated of her, by every one familiar with the pomp and gorgibusness of her diction, and the occasionally stately sweep of her melody,—so peculiarly appropriate both to the chivalric lay, and to the battle song. Accordingly, she has produced some spirit-stirring examples of ballad, of which we must endeavour to find room for a single example. The subject is thus related by Madame de Stael :—

“ Ivan le terrible étant déjà devenu vieux, assiégeait Novogorod. Les Boyards, le voyant affoibli, lui demandèrent s’il ne voulait pas donner le commandement de l’assaut à son fils. Sa fureur fut si grande à cette proposition, que rien ne put l’appaiser ;

son fils se prosterna à ses pieds ; il le repoussa, avec un coup d'une telle violence que, deux jours après, le malheureux en mourut. Le père, alors en désespoir, devint indifférent à la guerre comme au pouvoir, et ne survécut que peu de mois à son fils."

" IVAN THE CZAR.

- " He sat in silence on the ground,  
The old and haughty Czar ;  
Lonely though princes girt him round,  
And leaders of the war :  
He had cast his jeweled sabre,  
That many a field had won,  
To the earth, beside his youthful dead,  
His fair and first-born son.
- " With a robe of ermine for its bed,  
Was laid that form of clay,  
Where the light, a stormy sunset shed,  
Through the rich tent made its way ;  
And a sad and solemn beauty  
On the pallid face came down,  
Which the lord of nations mutely watched,  
In the dust, with his renown.
- " Low tones, at last, of woe and fear,  
From his full bosom broke ;—  
A mournful thing it was to hear  
How, then, the proud man spoke !  
The voice that through the combat  
Had shouted far and high,  
Came forth in strange, dull, hollow tones,  
Burdened with agony.
- " " There is no crimson on thy cheek,  
And on thy lip no breath ;  
I call thee, and thou dost not speak—  
They tell me this is death !  
And fearful things are whispering,  
That *I* the deed have done—  
For the honour of thy father's name,  
Look up—look up my son !
- " " Well might I know death's hue and mien,  
But on *thine* aspect, boy !  
What, till this moment, have I seen,  
Save pride and tameless joy ?  
Swiftest thou wert to battle,  
And bravest there of all—  
How *could* I think a warrior's frame  
Thus like a flower should fall !

- “ ‘ I will not bear that still, cold look—  
Rise up, thou fierce and free !  
Wake as the storm wakes ! I will brook  
All, save this calm, from thee !  
Lift brightly up, and proudly,  
Once more thy kindling eyes !  
Hath my word lost its power on earth ?  
I say to thee, arise !
- “ ‘ Didst thou not know I loved thee well ?  
Thou didst not ! and art gone,  
In bitterness of soul, to dwell  
Where man must dwell alone.  
Come back, young fiery spirit !  
If but one hour—to learn  
The secrets of the folded heart  
That seemed to thee so stern.
- “ ‘ Thou wert the first—the first fair child  
That in mine arms I pressed ;  
Thou wert the bright one that hast smiled,  
Like summer, on my breast !  
I reared thee as an eagle,  
To the chase thy steps I led,  
I bore thee on my battle-horse,—  
I look upon thee—dead !
- “ ‘ Lay down my warlike banners here,  
Never again to wave,  
And bury my red sword and spear,  
Chiefs ! in my first-born's grave !  
And leave me !—I have conquered,  
I have *slain*—my work is done !  
*Whom* have I slain ?—ye answer not,—  
*Thou*, too, art mute, my son !’
- “ And thus his wild lament was poured  
Through the dark, resounding night ;  
And the battle knew no more his sword,  
Nor the foaming steed his might.  
He heard strange voices moaning,  
In every wind that sighed ;  
From the searching stars of heaven he shrank,  
Humbly the conqueror died !”

The peculiarities which we have described as characterising the muse of Mrs Hemans, were all of them unpropitious to her success in dramatic writing. Her genius was essentially undramatic. Her very limited acquaintance with the action of life (arising out of the circumstances of her position), her one-sided

view of its morals, and the habit which she had fostered, of relying upon a picturesque and highly-coloured diction, to conceal her want of power over the springs of the affections, were so many reasons which should have pointed out the hopelessness for her of any attempt in that walk of literature. Her characters all speak that highly-enriched phraseology, which never was the language of the passions, and which, in fact, takes from them all air of reality. The illusions of the drama it was altogether beyond her power to create. It was, as Mr. Chorley states, at the instigation of Reginald Heber, that she first attempted composition in this form; and, by the aid of Mr. Milman, her "*Vespers of Palermo*" was, after many delays, produced at Covent Garden, in the winter of 1823. As might have been anticipated, it failed. Besides its numerous other faults, the characters are full of exaggeration, the plot is badly constructed, and its parts hang loosely together. Notwithstanding many fine passages which it contains, it is, in every point of view, one of the least successful of its author's performances.

"*The Siege of Valencia*" is a poem, which likewise assumes the dramatic form; but, being submitted to no other of the dramatic tests, may be read and judged of, as if it had appeared in any other shape. It is one of the finest of Mrs. Hemans' poems, and that which first exhibits her in full possession of her perfected powers. There is in it a more sustained energy than she had hitherto reached, or ever reached again; and it abounds in passages of earnest and passionate beauty. The Monk's tale is told with startling power; and the stern and lofty resolve of the high-souled father, subduing the throbs of natural agony at the bidding of principle, brought into perpetual conflict with the passionate pleadings and eloquent gushings of the mother, sweeping away all considerations of conventional duty in the wild rush of their irresistible tide, presents contrasts such as are of the very highest resources of art, and creates an interest in the heart of the most engrossing kind. To do justice to Mrs. Hemans, we should quote from this poem; but our space forbids our making extracts from its pages; and we can find no short passage which, detached from the rest, would convey any thing like a fair impression of its merit.

The "*Forest Sanctuary*," was, we believe, considered, by the poetess herself, as her best work; and, in some respects, we are disposed to give the confirmation of our judgment to that opinion. We think that, in this poem, she has not only touched the spring of one of the finest secrets of the heart, but has also gone deeper into its hiding places than on any other occasion. We waive all consideration of the subject of the poem. It has a controversial

basis,—to which Mrs. Hemans was manifestly unequal, both from the constitution of her mind, and from her entire want of the necessary acquaintance with the subject. Her letters, published by Mr. Chorley, prove that, in matters of controversial politics and religion, she was versed in the merest common-places of bigotry,—common-places which were traditional with her, and not a deduction from any reasonings of her own. “The poem,” she says, “is intended to describe the mental conflicts, as well as outward sufferings, of a Spaniard, who, flying from the religious persecutions of his own country, in the 16th century, takes refuge with his child in a North American forest. The story is supposed to be related by himself, amidst the wilderness which has afforded him an asylum.” We leave her in quiet possession of her story, which we need not trouble by any criticism. As might be expected, it presents, in its natural pictures—whether of the boundless forest, or a burial at sea—many fine passages, of that peculiar beauty with which the muse of Mrs. Hemans is most conversant. But the one specimen of a more subtle perception and refined sensibility than the poetess has anywhere else exhibited, we desire to quote for our readers; though we are apprehensive that its exquisite delicacy and *tenderness* may fail to be adequately conveyed, when it is separated from the pages describing that conflict of feelings which had preceded it. The stanzas in question aim at picturing that shadow, which falls between two hearts, when they have passed, by a change in one of them, into the influence of separate faiths—the sense of an obstacle, felt for the first time, to the full and entire intermingling of their wedded spirits:—

“Alas! for those that love and may not blend in prayer.”

The thought is one of great delicacy; and it is wrought out with a very fine pencil.

“I looked on Leonor, and if there seemed  
A cloud of more than pensiveness to rise  
In the faint smiles that o’er her features gleamed,  
And the soft darkness of her serious eyes,  
Misty with tender gloom, I called it nought  
But the fond exile’s pang, a lingering thought  
Of her own vale, with all its melodies  
And living light of streams. Her soul would rest  
Beneath your shades, I said, bowers of the gorgeous west!

“Oh! could we live in visions! could we hold  
Delusion faster, longer, to our breast,  
When it shuts from us, with its mantle’s fold,  
That which we see not, and are therefore blest!

But they, our loved and loving,—they to whom  
We have spread out our souls in joy and gloom,—  
*Their* looks and accents unto ours address'd  
Have been a language of familiar tone,  
Too long, to breathe, at last, dark sayings and unknown.

“ I told my heart 'twas but the exile's woe  
Which pressed on that sweet bosom ;— I deceived  
My heart but half,—a whisper faint and low,  
Haunting it ever, and at times believed,  
Spoke of some deeper cause. How oft we seem  
Like those that dream, and *know* the while they dream,  
'Midst the soft falls of airy voices grieved,  
And troubled, while bright phantoms round them play,  
By a dim sense that all will float and fade away !

“ Yet, as if chasing joy, I wooed the breeze,  
To speed me onward with the wings of morn.  
—Oh, far amidst the solitary seas,  
Which were not made for man, what man hath borne,  
Answering their moan with his !—what *thou* didst bear,  
My lost and loveliest ! wifely that secret care  
Grew terror, and thy gentle spirit, worn  
By its dull brooding weight, gave way at last,  
Beholding me as one from hope for ever cast.

“ For unto thee, as through all change, revealed  
Mine inward being lay. In other eyes  
I had to bow me yet, and make a shield,  
To fence my burning bosom, of disguise,  
By the still hope sustained ere long to win  
Some sanctuary, whose green retreats within,  
My thoughts, unfettered, to their source might rise,  
Like songs and scents of morn ; but thou didst look  
Through all my soul,—and thine even unto fainting shook.

“ Fallen, fallen I seemed—yet oh ! not less beloved,  
Though from thy love was plucked the early pride,  
And harshly by a gloomy faith reproved,  
And seared with shame ! though each young flower had died,  
There was the root, strong, living, not the less  
That all it yielded now was bitterness ;  
Yet still such love as quits not misery's side,  
Nor drops from guilt its ivy-like embrace,  
Nor turns away from death's its pale heroic face.

“ Yes ! thou hadst followed me through fear and flight ;  
Thou wouldst have followed had my pathway led  
Even to the scaffold ; had the flashing light  
Of the raised axe made strong men shrink with dread,



Thou, 'midst the hush of thousands, wouldst have been  
 With thy clasped hands beside me kneeling seen,  
 And meekly bowing to the shame thy head—  
 The shame!—oh! making beautiful to view  
 The might of human love!—fair thing! so bravely true!

“ There was thine agony—to love so well  
 Where fear made love life's chastener. Heretofore  
 Whate'er of earth's disquiet round thee fell,  
 Thy soul, o'erpassing its dim bounds, could soar  
 Away to sunshine, and thy clear eye speak  
 Most of the skies when grief most touched thy cheek.  
 Now, that far brightness faded, never more  
 Couldst thou lift heavenwards, for its hope, thy heart,  
 Since at heaven's gate it seemed that thou and I must part.

“ Alas! and life hath moments when a glance  
 (If thought to sudden watchfulness be stirred)—  
 A flush—a fading of the cheek, perchance,  
 A word—less, less—the *cadence* of a word—  
 Lets in our gaze the mind's dim veil beneath,  
 Thence to bring haply knowledge fraught with death!  
 —Even thus, what never from thy lip was heard  
 Broke on my soul:—I knew that, in thy sight,  
 I stood, howe'er beloved, a recreant from the light!”

With “ The Siege of Valencia” and “ The Forest Sanctuary,” the conspicuous progress of Mrs. Hemans' mind was at an end; and the future shews us nothing but its decline.

The death of her mother, in 1827, and the marriage of her sister, in the following year, combined with the desire of obtaining opportunities of society for herself, and additional facilities for the education of her sons, induced Mrs. Hemans to leave Wales, and fix her residence at Wavertree, in the neighbourhood of Liverpool. Here, with the exception of occasional absences, during which she twice visited Scotland, and once made an excursion to the English lakes, she passed the three years whose records fill the principal portion of Mr. Chorley's volumes. Of these records we have already intimated our opinion. Exhibiting, as they do, great weaknesses in the character of this gifted woman, we certainly do not envy the taste, which has exposed them to the world. Through the whole correspondence, and its accompanying commentaries, there is exhibited by her a craving vanity, a restless and feverish anxiety for display, a desire to be always *en représentation*, and all this under the studious affectation of very much disliking the eminence, on which she would remind her correspondents that she stands. It was at Wavertree

that she formed her acquaintance with Mr. Chorley's family; and we find her constantly walking over to his house, with some adulatory letter in her pocket, or some story of the way in which her reputation has discovered her retreat, in order that she may explain to its members how disagreeable a thing is fame. Nor is this all. These stories, and these disclaimers, are not unfrequently accompanied by remarks on others,—persons, to whom she acknowledges that she is bound by ties of gratitude, but persons, nevertheless, on whom she passes observations, unguarded, and, perhaps, unmeant, but calculated to produce the most unpleasant feelings both in this country and in America.—Was it right in Mr. Chorley to give such documents, and such anecdotes to the world?

Another reprehensible, and, with her, ungraceful, habit of mind, which Mrs. Hemans seems to have contracted during her residence at Wavertree, was exhibited in an assumption of girlishness—an affectation of being a romp, under cover of which she was perpetually endeavouring to be thought to say and do the silliest things in the world. Sir Walter Scott once administered a reproof to her on the subject, of which she seems to have been so little sensible, that she reports it as a very delightful joke to Mr. Chorley, while he, again, is so unconscious of its significance, that, in his turn, he reports it to the world! We happen to know, that she did herself great wrong by these habits, and created impressions very much the reverse of those which she intended to produce.—But it is time to escape from these painful frivolities. The poetical life of Mrs. Hemans, during her residence at Wavertree, was a blank; and we gladly, therefore, pass on to views more agreeable to that love which we entertain for her memory.

In the spring of 1831, Mrs. Hemans took leave of England for the last time, and established her abode in Dublin. Here, in the society of her friends, her mind instantly regained its tone, and her spirit rose up once more to the full height of its moral stature. Indeed, her previous visit to the Lakes seems to have led the way to this better frame of feeling, and, perhaps, as a consequence, to her determination (formed amid their solitudes) of quitting Liverpool. The step was a wise one. All the habits and sentiments which had characterised her residence there, seem to have been as completely lost sight of, from the moment she had left it, as if they had never been entertained: even her subsequent letters to the writer of these Memoirs, though very kind (as her nature was), exhibit a dignity and self-possession which, we think, must have astonished him. It was obvious

that the separation was one of more than distance. Here, too, by degrees, under the influences of reflection, and amid the warnings of sickness, a still further "change came o'er the spirit of her dream," and her heart became solemnised, as she drew within the shadow of that last dwelling to which she was fast hastening. She had for some time formed the design of dedicating her muse to the service of the temple; but the resolution was formed when she had no longer the opportunity of connecting its execution with the exercise of her fullest powers; and indeed, looking at the reasons to which we have adverted in the course of this notice, we doubt whether her powers were ever equal to the successful performance of such a scheme. Her poetry was, as we have seen, too much the result of her peculiarities of thinking and writing, to flourish in separation from them.

Her "Scenes and Hymns of Life," published during this last portion of her days, and the poems collected as her poetical remains since her death, are, for the most part, written in this new tone, and devoted to this better philosophy. But their merit, in other respects, is far below that of her previous productions. Her lyric of "Despondency and Aspiration," which has been praised, is obscure and faulty, and her "Sabbath Sonnet," the latest music of her lyre, and her song of "The Swan," though touching as dictated from a death-bed, and sacred for the feelings amid which it must have been composed, and for the subjects with which it deals, must look to those reasons alone for the interest with which it will long continue to be read. She exercised her high gift of song, for the last time (and in the service of him who gave it) on the 26th day of April, 1835: and on the 16th day of the following month, passed calmly away, through the portals of a gentle sleep, into the shadow of the grave.

In the course of our remarks upon her various poems, our estimate of her genius, and our opinion of her chances with posterity, have, we think, been sufficiently expressed. She wrote too rapidly, and too much, and her powers were impaired by the too long indulgence of those peculiarities, to which we have alluded. But it has been truly said of her, by a writer of her own sex, whom Mr. Chorley quotes, that "she never degraded the poet's art: if she did not as well, as, under more fortunate circumstances, she might have done, she never published anything that might not be said to make a necessary part of her poetic reputation." It is hard upon her, that Mr. Chorley should have done this for her!—We can have no doubt whatever that the music of her fine lyrics will float down the stream of time; and that her name will

be a familiar word on our children's lips. It is by her detached pieces that she has the best chance of surviving,—though not by them alone that she deserves to survive. Her poetry has not, in other instances, taken the best forms for popularity: but the one will preserve the other, and the gifted will read them both. We only trust that her name and works will go down to posterity, uninjured by the silly records contained in Mr. Chorley's memorials.



# THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

APRIL, 1837.

---

- ART. I.—1. *The Life of John Hunter, F.R.S., (prefixed to a New Edition of his Works, by J. F. Palmer.)* By Drewry Ottley, Esq. 8vo. 1837.—pp. 197.
2. *The Hunterian Oration, delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons, February 14, 1834.* By William Lawrence, F.R.S. 8vo. 1834.—pp. 50.
3. *The Hunterian Oration, delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons, February 14, 1837.* By Sir Benjamin C. Brodie, Bart., F.R.S. 8vo. 1837.—pp. 38.

WE are induced to notice the above publications, principally on account of their containing a vindication of British science; but, independently of this, the contemplation of the highest order of genius must ever form an interesting subject to the general reader; especially where, as in the present instance, the gifted individual has surmounted those thousand impediments which obstruct the progress of ambition:—

“ What rugged places lie between  
Adventurous virtue's early toils  
And her triumphal throne.”

A new impulse has recently been given to the fame of Hunter, in consequence of the College of Surgeons having, at a considerable outlay of capital, rebuilt the Hunterian Museum, and made such arrangements for the display of its unrivalled treasures, as cannot, we venture to affirm, be equalled in any other city in Europe.

John Hunter was born in Kilbride East, Lanarkshire, in Scotland, on Feb. 14th, 1728. During his early years, he does not appear to have exhibited any presages of future genius; but, on the contrary, partly owing to the poverty of his parents, and partly to the indulgence of his mother, (he being the youngest of ten children) his education seems to have been much neglected, so that when, in 1748, he came to London to his brother, Dr. William Hunter, he was a rough untutored lad, wholly devoid of those qualities which appear requisite to take a lead in a

learned profession. He began, however, to show the mettle of his nature very soon, by making such progress in anatomy, as to become a public teacher in less than a twelvemonth; but his early habits still adhered to him, nor did he wholly throw them off to the end of his days. The following is the account which his biographer gives of this period of his life:—

“ He was fond of company, and as he had not, like Haller, forsworn the use of wine on commencing his medical studies, though he found it necessary to do so in after life, he mixed much in the society of young men of his own standing, and joined in that sort of dissipation which men at his age, freed from restraint, are but too apt to indulge in. Here, as in graver matters, his ambition urged him to take the lead of his companions, amongst whom he went by the familiar title of ‘ Jack Hunter.’ Nor was he always very nice in the choice of his associates, but sometimes sought entertainment in the coarse broad humour to be found amid the lower ranks of society. He was employed by his brother to cater for the dissecting-room, in the course of which employment he became a great favourite with that, certainly not too respectable, class of persons, the resurrection men; and one of the amusements in which he took especial pleasure, was to mingle with the gods in the shilling gallery, for the purpose of assisting to damn the productions of unhappy authors, an office in which he is said to have displayed peculiar tact and vigour.”—p. 10.

During the summer months he attended the surgical wards of the different public hospitals, and under Professor Cheselden imbibed his first lessons in that science in which he was afterwards to shine as so conspicuous an ornament. Cheselden was not only the greatest practical surgeon which this country ever produced, but he displayed a considerable taste in the fine arts; he was fond of poetry, and an intimate friend of Pope; he had also made architecture his study, and it was from his plans that Putney Bridge, and the former Surgeons’ Hall in the Old Bailey, were built. The following is a characteristic anecdote of this great man, although such feelings, in regard to operations, are much more commonly experienced by the best surgeons than is generally supposed; and we ourselves happen to have heard, the two most eminent surgeons of the present day declare, that they have rarely undertaken any great operation, without feeling, on the preceding night, a considerable degree of inquietude.

“ Cheselden’s manners were exceedingly kind and gentle, and notwithstanding the extensive practice he had enjoyed, he always, before an operation, felt sick at the thought of the pain he was about to inflict; though during its performance his coolness and presence of mind never forsook him. In alluding to this feeling, Morand relates an anecdote of a French surgeon, who, on visiting the hospital, expressed great surprise at witnessing such an evidence of weakness, as he considered it, on the

part of so famous a surgeon. After the operation was over, the visitor was invited by Cheselden to accompany him to the fencing school, whither he was going to see a sparring match ; but here the tables were completely turned, for no sooner did the contest begin, than the stranger turned pale at the sight, and was obliged speedily to betake himself to the open air.” —p. 9.

Hunter was a great economist of time. He was above the artifice of attempting to heighten the opinion of his genius by concealing the amount of his labour. He laboured, and cared not who knew it. Four hours at night and one hour after dinner was the only refreshment which, for twenty years, he ever allotted to his body. To witness an interesting or extraordinary case he would take any trouble, or go almost any distance, without a chance of pecuniary recompense ; but to the daily routine of practice he always returned unwillingly, and even when he had acquired a lucrative and extensive business, he valued it only as affording him the means of pursuing his favourite studies. This feeling he would often express to his friend Lynn, when called to see a patient, by saying, as he unwillingly laid by his dissecting instruments, “ Well, Lynn, I must go and earn this d—d guinea, or I shall be sure and want it to-morrow.”

“ On his arrival in London, Mr. Thomas, in company with Mr. Nicol, by whom he was to be introduced, called on Hunter ; they found him dressing. ‘ Well, young gentleman,’ said Hunter, when the first ceremonies of introduction were over, ‘ so you are come to town to be a surgeon ; and how long do you intend to stay ? ’ ‘ One year,’ was the reply. ‘ Then,’ said he, ‘ I’ll tell you what, that won’t do ; I’ve been here a great many years, and have worked hard too, and yet I don’t know the principles of the art.’ After some farther conversation, Mr. Thomas was directed to call again in an hour, which he did, and accompanied Hunter to the hospital, where he said to him, after the business was over, ‘ come to me to-morrow morning, young gentleman, and I will put you farther in the way of things ; come early in the morning, as soon after four as you can. It was summer ; Mr. Thomas kept the appointment, and found Hunter, at that early hour, busily engaged in dissecting beetles.” —p. 115.

The following contains a useful hint to those parents who proceed on the ill-judged system of attempting to harden their children to the cold and variable climate of this country :—

“ Mr. Nicol, bookseller to the king, had lost five children, and his wife was in the family-way for the sixth. Hunter, in passing one day, dropped in, and asked Mr. Nicol if he intended to kill this, as he had killed all the rest of his children. Mr. N., who was a North-countryman, had, on false principles, endeavoured to inure his children to cold and rough usage, thinking that if they could not survive this they would never live to be reared to manhood. Not understanding such a question,



therefore, he demanded of Hunter what he meant. 'Why,' said Hunter, 'do you know what is the temperature of a hen with her callow brood? because, if you don't, I'll tell you.' He then proceeded to explain the necessity of warmth to young animals, and convinced Mr. Nicol of the propriety of changing his plan, which he did, and with complete success."—p. 29.

And on another occasion, when his funds were at a low ebb, the following rather curious dialogue occurred with the same gentleman:—

"'Pray, George, have you got any money in your pocket?' Mr. Nicol replied in the affirmative. 'Have you got five guineas, because if you have and will lend it to me, you shall go halves?' 'Halves in what?' enquired his friend. 'Why halves in a magnificent tiger which is now dying in Castle-street.' Mr. Nicol lent the money, and Hunter got the tiger."

After ten years' unexampled labour in the study of human anatomy, he turned his attention to that of animals, with a view to elucidate the general principles of physiology. His health, however, being much impaired by the intensity of his studies, he went abroad in 1760, as surgeon on the staff, and remained with the army three years. Upon his return, he settled in London, where, by pursuing his researches with unabated ardour, he at length attained the first station as physiologist and surgeon in Europe, and accumulated a museum, illustrative of the functions of life, such as has had no parallel in the world.

It may, perhaps, be necessary to mention that the "Hunterian Oration" was established in 1813, by Dr. Baillie, the nephew, and Sir Everard Home, the brother-in-law, of Mr. Hunter, for the purpose of commemorating the fame of their departed friend, as well as of paying a passing tribute of respect to such other distinguished worthies of the profession as may have contributed during their lives to the advancement of science. Recollecting, as we do, the magnificent "Eloges Historiques" of Baron Cuvier, delivered before the Institute of France, we are far from thinking this practice undeserving of commendation, as holding out a laudable stimulus to ambition to those who are embarked in the pursuits of science; but we are of opinion that such commemorations should only occur occasionally, and that great care should be taken that none but the most competent persons be selected to deliver these orations. At the College of Surgeons, and also at the College of Physicians, in London, the Hunterian and Harveian orations are delivered *annually*, by a sort of rotation among the members of the council, and hence it has happened that these institutions have in most cases been signal failures, as it requires not only talents of a higher order than can

be met with in the generality, but acquirements of a universal kind, to be able to judge with any exactness of the attainments of other men. The orations which we have placed at the head of this article are exceptions to the general rule, alike honourable to the dead and to the living, and evince not only a consummate knowledge of the genius of him whose merits they particularly undertake to celebrate, but a general acquaintance with the whole circle of literature, and particularly with those branches of science which are more immediately allied to medicine. The following sketches of two of Hunter's most able disciples, who contributed so much by their talents to the elevation of modern surgery to its present high rank, afford favourable specimens of the authors' talents for delineation of character:—

“The actions, the writings, and the conversations of Mr. Hunter operated powerfully on a kindred genius among his own countrymen,—I mean Mr. Abernethy, whose bust, by the greatest living sculptor, now appears in this theatre for the first time. The superiority of intellect that distinguished this great teacher was shown in the very commencement of his career. He began to teach his profession at an age when others are occupied in learning it, that is, immediately on the expiration of his pupilage; a circumstance which, however honourable to his talents and acquirements, was not equally favourable to that slow process of mental culture, to that long course of observation and reflection so indispensably necessary for the solid improvement of surgery. His surgical and physiological essays, published at an early age, display an original turn of thinking, and talent for observation which have seldom been surpassed. He may justly claim the great merit of having excited and exemplified, by his writings and lectures, a more scientific investigation and treatment of surgical diseases. He learned from Mr. Hunter, of whom he was a devoted admirer, to bring the lights of physiology to bear on surgical practice. Hence he was one of the first in this country to vindicate the natural rank of surgery as a branch of general pathology. He taught us to extend our views beyond the narrow limits of local causes and remedies; he pointed out the more general influences to which diseases of parts owe their origin, and hence he deduced the general means of treating those affections. He saw clearly that there is only one kind of Pathology; that there is no distinction in source, nature, and treatment, between medical and surgical diseases; and, consequently, that surgeons ought to study general pathology and therapeutics. On this account he has been regarded as an intruder on the territory of physic, and has been accused of wishing to make surgeons physicians. If it is meant to charge him with wishing that we should add to our surgical knowledge that of medicine, the accusation is well founded, and does him great honour. By thus exciting surgeons to cultivate medical science generally, he has, at the same time, benefited the public and increased the respectability of his own profession.

"Under some roughness of exterior, as regards manner, Mr. Abernethy possessed warm feelings, a benevolent disposition, and a generous spirit. He freely bestowed professional and pecuniary assistance on the needy and deserving. He had remarkable quickness of perception and reasoning, and a lively fancy. Hence he did not always make sufficient allowance for dulness and ignorance. He was sometimes betrayed into impatience, and resorted too quickly to the use of wit, of which he possessed a large share. He always retained the complete command of this weapon, even in his angriest moods. I once saw him in a warm altercation with a gentleman: high words passed between them. The gentleman, irritated by something that fell from Mr. Abernethy said:—'How, sir, do you say so? you will be made to swallow your words.' 'Ah,' said Mr. Abernethy, with one of his knowing looks, 'there would be no use in that; they would be sure to come up again.' A great many anecdotes are still current in the profession, founded on curious dialogues, sharp sallies, and lively repartees, which occurred in his consultation room, or in other intercourse with his patients. The authority of some may be dubious; but I can assert that he is justly entitled to the credit of all the best."—*Lawrence*, p. 25.

"I shall endeavour" (Sir Benjamin Brodie observes) "to describe Sir Everard Home, such as he appears to me to have been when I first became acquainted with him. He was a great practical surgeon. His mind went directly to the leading points of the case before him, disregarding all those minor points by which minds of smaller capacity are perplexed and misled. Hence his views of disease were clear, and such as were easily communicated to his pupils; and his practice was simple and decided. He never shrunk from difficulties; but, on the contrary, seemed to have a pleasure in meeting with them, and overcoming them; and I am satisfied that to this one of his qualities many of his patients were indebted for their lives. Much valuable information is to be found in his surgical works; and his observations on ulcers, and those on the diseases of the prostate gland, may be perused with advantage by the best educated surgeons of modern times. He possessed the art of employing every instant of his time; and could with perfect ease transfer his attention at once from one subject to another quite different from it. Hence it was that he was enabled, although engaged in a large private practice, to pursue the study of comparative anatomy to a considerable extent. His earlier papers on this subject, communicated to the Royal Society, are of great and acknowledged value; but, unfortunately for his reputation, his ambition rather increased than diminished, while his mental powers were gradually declining under the influence of an indifferent state of health and increasing years. In his latter days he had an overweening anxiety to appear before the world as a discoverer, and his friends in the Council of the Royal Society too readily inserted, whatever he offered to them in the Society's Transactions; and the result has been that many of his later communications are of such a nature that his best friends must now regret that they were ever published."—*Brodie*, p. 29.

Mr. Ottley has developed the various circumstances of Mr. Hunter's life with great judgment and discrimination. His style

is lively and perspicuous; his narrative vigorous, and enlivened by the judicious introduction of anecdote; and his opinions of the writings and discoveries of the author always characterized by their justness and impartiality. It is a remarkable circumstance that this should be the first adequate biography of this extraordinary man which has yet been given to the public.

The orations of Mr. Lawrence and Sir Benjamin Brodie are not unworthy of the fame of these celebrated surgeons, while they tend to exalt the character of Hunter to the loftiest pinnacle of fame. This eminence, however, was not attained without the most unexampled perseverance.

“ Hunter was destined to undergo a long trial of those qualities of passive fortitude and active perseverance, of which few situations in life demand a larger share than that of a young man commencing practice in the higher branches of the professions of law or medicine in London; for assuredly it needs no small degree of fortitude to bear up against the disappointments a young man so placed must experience in finding his merits overlooked, whilst the world is showering wealth on many around him, whom he, at least, thinks far less deserving than himself. It requires, too, much steady perseverance constantly to keep in view the destined goal, resisting the allurements which have so often led men of superior talents to desert the arduous contest, and devote themselves to the pursuits of literature or of science; pursuits which, though delightful, can scarcely be extensively followed without the neglect of objects more essential to those who seek for fortune as well as fame from the practice of a profession.

“ Hunter had also a great contempt for those minor tactics which constitute so large a portion of what has been termed the art of rising in the world; and they who have carefully watched the progress of men to fortune, know full well how much of their success has often been due to the judicious management of these auxiliary means. It would be egregious folly to suppose that a man could ever attain to high repute as a surgeon in London, without possessing a large share of the essential requisites for the practice of his profession: but, on the other hand, it requires no great penetration to perceive, that the vast difference in the amount of her favours vouchsafed by Fortune to her different votaries, must be accounted for in some other way than by the amount of professional talent possessed by each. ‘ He that is only *real*, had need have excellent great parts of virtue,’ says Bacon, ‘ as the stone had need be rich that is set without foil;’ and we cannot have a better illustration of the truth of this observation than is afforded by Hunter’s tardy progress in the path to fortune, compared with the rapid strides of others, who, in professional attainments would be the first to acknowledge themselves but the humble disciples of this great master.”—*Ottley*, pp. 25-27.

In reference to Mr. Hunter, the same language is held by all those who can be considered competent to form an opinion of his merits; all seem to admit, that he is eminently entitled to

the character of a man of genius, and that, like a great intellectual workman, he not only cleared the fields of philosophy and pathology of those weeds which obstruct the growth of real science, but that he reared in their place a system of the greatest strength and beauty, which has existed unimpaired amidst the progress of discovery. Each year, indeed, seems only to add to the correctness of his conclusions, and to increase the wonder which the extent and accuracy of his researches are calculated to excite.

"It has sometimes happened," Mr. Lawrence observes, "to men of superior minds, to extend their researches and views so far beyond the existing state of knowledge, that they may be said to live and labour for posterity rather than for their own time. Lord Bacon must have felt this when he framed the celebrated passage in his will,—'My name and memory I leave to foreign nations, and to mine own countrymen after some time to be passed over.' This was the case in some respects with Mr. Hunter: many of his contemporaries could not perceive the full extent and application of those labours, which form a new era in physiology and surgery. Some of the common minds who were about this great man, could not even comprehend why he should spend his time in the dissection of animals, and in physiological experiments: they could not see how the researches of comparative anatomy, and the making of preparations, could contribute to the improvement of surgery. The admiration of posterity makes up, in these cases, for the indifference and the sneers of contemporaries. Thus the reputation of Mr. Hunter has been constantly increasing since the time of his death. Indeed, the vigour and originality of his genius, his comprehension and depth of thought, could not be appreciated until the contents of his museum were well understood, and until it was rendered generally useful by proper arrangements and good catalogues."—p. 18.

Sir Benjamin Brodie says—

"I am inclined to believe that I should not at all exaggerate what we owe to John Hunter, if I were to assert, that, with the exception of Sir Isaac Newton, there has been no individual, in these latter times, who has done so much as he has done, towards altering and elevating the character of the peculiar sciences to which he devoted his attention; and be it observed, that these were not sciences of limited extent. They embraced whatever belongs to the physical phenomena of life; the natural and healthy structure of animals, from the lowest to the highest, and the aberrations and changes which constitute disease."—p. 15.

And then referring to those scientific pursuits, for which Hunter was so much distinguished, he adds—

"Next to the moral conduct and honourable principles of its members, is there any thing which so eminently tends to raise our profession in the estimation of the public, as its connexion with philosophical pursuits? Is it not an advantage in any profession to have some object which may engage the attention beyond the drudgery of professional practice, to which the mind may turn with delight as a relaxation from

severer duties, to which it may retreat as a refuge in the hour of anxiety and disappointment? I would ask, moreover, if there be any department of human knowledge more worthy of the attention of the philosopher? Are there any sciences which offer to us a greater number and diversity of facts, calculated at once to awaken and gratify curiosity, or to excite, in the reflecting mind, feelings of a sublimer nature? Everywhere around us, in the air, in the waters, on the surface, and even in the dark deep caves in the recesses of the earth, we recognise the operation of that mighty principle which animates the universe. We trace it by the means of the microscope, where the effects which it produces are imperceptible to our unassisted vision. We lose sight of it only at that point at which the power of lenses will carry us no farther; and geology exhibits it to us in the various forms which life assumed in those remote and mysterious ages, which were antecedent to all human history. A boundless field is open to our observation, and whatever part of it we explore, we discover subjects of admiration, not inferior to those which are presented to the astronomer when he looks into the starry heavens. It is in this part of the creation, more than in any other, that we discern the manifestations of the Creator. In the history and structure of individual animals, we find marks of intelligence, power and benevolence, beyond what our minds can measure, while the uniformity of the design, which pervades the whole system, affords an unanswerable argument in favour of the unity of the cause in which it has had its origin."—p. 36.

There is one circumstance in the life of Hunter which appears to us to have received less consideration from his biographers than it deserves, and that is the influence of his early education over his more mature years. That the seeds of future fame are generally sown much earlier than is supposed, we readily admit; but this is not always the case. Sometimes the very reverse happens, and the reaction arising from neglected education, operates as a stimulus which overbears all obstacles. What would have been the consequences had Hunter pursued the advice of his elder brother, and entered as a fellow-commoner at Oxford, it is useless now to enquire; but it seems highly probable that he would not have made any eminent advances in this species of study, for which his mind did not seem to be in the least qualified; his tastes, also, were probably too fixed to receive a new bias at this period of his life, while his pride must have rebelled against those mortifications to which his ignorance would probably have exposed him; moreover, we exceedingly doubt if the organization of Hunter's mind was ever susceptible of a classical taste. It was, to borrow the expression of one of his own pupils, "too manly for trifles—too sturdy to receive any inclinations but those which it yielded to demonstrative evidence."

The immediate ill effects of a neglected education were but too

visible in many parts of Hunter's character. The sterner virtues of his mind were not mitigated by that courtesy which characterises the high-caste surgeon and physician of the present day; his manners were often rude, his language frequently coarse; and his delivery of himself, as well orally as in composition, alike deficient in grace and perspicuity. Mr. Locke somewhere observes, that want of perspicuity of expression is always the effect of confusion of thought; but this is one of that class of dogmas, which, however untrue, it is difficult to controvert. If we may judge of a man's thoughts by his deeds (the truest of all tests), Mr. Hunter's perceptions were not less clear and accurate than those of Locke himself. In his Museum, which is the standard by which we would try Hunter's merits, no such defects are apparent.

"Nature is here made to be her own expositor, and the treasures she has poured forth come fresh to the mind from the fountains of knowledge, unimpaired by passing through the imperfect medium of language, and unimpeachably proclaiming the genius of him, by whose labours they were brought to light."

Lord Bacon has an observation, which accounts more satisfactorily for Hunter's great achievements than any other that we have met with. "Whoever," he says, "hath anything fixed in his person that doth induce contempt, hath also a perpetual spur in himself to rescue and deliver himself from scorn. It stirreth in him *industry*." We doubt not it was some such consideration as this that operated as the motive to Hunter's incredible exertions; for feeling, as regards the exterior graces of breeding and the accomplishments of literature, that he could not stand on the same level with men of education, he resolved to revenge himself on nature by establishing a claim of a different sort. After the manner of King Richard, he may be supposed to have apostrophised:

"I, that am rudely stamp'd, and want love's majesty,  
 \*                    \*                    since I cannot prove a lover,  
 To entertain these fair well-spoken days,—  
 I am determin'd to prove a villain."

Of course, we cannot be supposed to mean this in a literal sense, but simply that the whole tide of Hunter's ambition was directed into one channel, in consequence of the usual avenues to distinction being closed against him. "Jesse Foot," he says, "accuses me of not understanding the dead languages; but I could teach him that, on the dead body, which he never knew in any language, dead or living." Perhaps it may be accounted a fortunate circumstance, that a great similarity of character existed between Sir Joseph Banks and Mr. Hunter in this respect, as it served to

cement the friendship of these great men, from which the latter reaped many advantages.

We are far from wishing to appear paradoxical, and yet we cannot but refer the extraordinary developement of Hunter's mind to the absence of that discipline which is usually required to call its powers forth. One of the chief objects of study is to strengthen the reasoning faculty, which faculty in Hunter was of so powerful a cast by nature, that it scarcely needed artificial training. Scholastic exercises and irresponsible debate may sharpen men's wits, but it requires the real business of life to strengthen their judgments. Hunter constantly appealed to observation and experiment in all his researches, and drew all his information from the undeviating dictates of nature; but whoever will consult such oracles must exercise his own judgment. Nature only furnishes the raw materials of knowledge, but leaves the office of converting them to any useful purpose to the industry of her votaries. Proceeding on the golden rule of taking nothing upon trust, Hunter examined every subject for himself, scrutinized every fact, viewed it in every possible relation, and that with so much accuracy and patience as often to discover those remote analogies which are the first harbingers of discovery. To his friend Jenner he writes as follows: "I thank you for your experiment on the hedgehog; but why do you ask me a question by way of solving it? Why not try the experiment? repeat all the experiments upon a hedgehog as soon as you receive this, *and they will give you the solution*,"—an apt and significant commentary on Lord Bacon's precept: "*Non fingendum aut excogitandum quid natura faciat aut ferat, sed observandum et experiendum.*" We are bound, however, to state, that this distrust of authority was too often carried to excess, and this confidence in himself too often verged into contemptuousness of others. These were the infirmities of a great mind.

"Some have lamented," Mr. Lawrence observes, "Mr. Hunter's deficient education, his ignorance of languages and books: I think unreasonably. From his brother, who was intimately versed in the literature of his profession, ancient and modern, and from other well-informed men, his contemporaries and fellow-labourers, he could learn in the easiest way all that had been done and thought in other times and countries. His whole life was spent in dissection, observation, experiment, and reflection. How could he have been better occupied? So precious are the fruits of his enquiries into all the actions and sufferings of organised beings, that we should not be willing to part with the least of them for a whole load of scholastic erudition and book learning.

"It is instructive to observe the course which Mr. Hunter pursued in his early studies, and which he followed throughout life with undeviating constancy. Without wasting time on the opinions of lecturers and



writers, he resorted at once to nature, to the source from which the masters of our art have derived their knowledge, from which lecturers and writers must draw their information, unless they should be contented, as too often happens, with copying from others. Having reached London at the beginning of the anatomical season, he immediately entered the dissecting room; and we find him, in the following spring, at Chelsea Hospital, with Cheselden. He would not take his knowledge at second hand, but was determined to see with his own eyes, and to examine everything for himself. He was incessantly occupied with the great volume of nature, appealing ever to those pure springs of knowledge which she pours out with unsparing hand at the bidding of her industrious worshippers. No one could have said with greater truth, — ‘*Juvat integros accedere fontes atque haurire.*’”—p. 12.

In common with other men who have achieved to themselves great names, or accomplished revolutions in science, Hunter possessed an unwearied industry, which the iron strength of his physical constitution enabled him to endure. The poet says, that “some men are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them.” In one sense Hunter was born great, for he was born with a vigorous understanding; but in another sense he achieved greatness, in so far as his understanding was accompanied with those accessories of industry and patience, which alone lead genius on to greatness. The qualities of his mind were, in fact, admirably tempered for the investigation of abstruse truths depending on accurate observation, and the comprehensive survey and comparison of facts. No object was too minute, none too large, for his attention. We are equally astonished at the minuteness of his information, and the extent of his views. His ardour was restrained, but never abated, by his patience. His imagination was discursive, fertile in expedients, and in pointing out new tracts of enquiry; and yet it rarely misled him to any extent into the doubtful regions of hypothesis. His love of truth was more than a counterpoise to his love of fame, while his extensive knowledge of facts was ever at hand to counteract a precipitate tendency to generalization.

The extraordinary compass of Hunter’s intellect is in nothing more remarkably displayed than in his Museum, in which we see figured forth a conception of the utmost magnitude, embracing the whole organized world, arranged according to their functions in an ascending series, and illustrated by apposite specimens from every rank of creation. Nor did his view stop here, but it extended to every deviation from the healthy structure and every anomaly of form; by which arrangement disease is made to be the interpreter of health, and the abnormal productions of nature the exponent of those recondite processes which terminate

in the evolution of the fœtus. We do not dwell on the perfect manner in which this scheme has been carried out, the diversified nature of the illustrations, or the minute and skilful manner in which they are displayed (although in these respects they have never been surpassed), but on the grandeur and comprehensiveness of the scheme itself. We conceive that it would not be difficult for a very second-rate order of understanding to complete a sketch thus once given, or to modify it in some unimportant particulars; but we can imagine no higher exertion of intellect than the embodiment of such a conception in the first instance out of the scattered elements of science. The symmetry of the plan conceals from us, in fact, the vastness of the proportions, and our present familiarity with the subject the extent and difficulty of the undertaking. We should, in order to judge rightly of this, carry back our minds to the same period of time, and contemplate physiology as it then existed; for, without doing this, we cannot institute a parallel between Hunter and those who have followed in the same track. What was said of his great prototype, Lord Bacon, may, with equal truth, be affirmed of him—"If a second HUNTER arise, he must be ignorant of the first."

This happy conjunction of a comprehensive with a minute turn of mind—faculties so seldom found united in the same individual—is the cause why Hunter's principles have remained unshaken by the advances of science, and his writings have preserved their full value to the present period—the former for their comprehensiveness and soundness—the latter for the choice and variety of their facts. It is owing to the same cause that the casual hints of such minds often assume the guise of prophetic, or at least intuitive, anticipations of truth, and prove the pregnant germs of future discoveries. They are, in fact, those remote and conjectural analogies which occur to enlarged minds in the progress of reflection; which have only not been expanded into established principles of science, from want of time to follow up the enquiry. We might adduce numerous examples of this kind, both from the writings and museum of Hunter, if our time and space did not fail us.

It is probable, that Hunter was the first who had a full perception of the inaptitude of all the former methods of physiological investigation; and that to him we must ascribe the honour of introducing a more philosophical method of research. Haller lived about the same period, and in many respects is deserving of a comparison with Hunter; but their methods of investigation were totally different. In medical literature Haller had no equal. His capacious mind grasped, without difficulty, the whole circle of existing knowledge; his conclusions were always those of a judi-

cial understanding; his reasonings were uniformly luminous, and his hints were invariably stamped with the character of sense; but his genius was not of an original turn, and he, personally, did not materially advance the boundaries of science; although his labours very much contributed to this effect, by concentrating, with incredible research, all the knowledge of his time.

But Hunter did not only possess a truly philosophic mind, but he was at the same time a great practical surgeon, who considered that there was no real distinction in nature between what is termed a principle of science and a rule of art. Under this latter view he has been compared with Pott and Desault, the respective leaders of the profession in France and England about this period; but the genius of the latter was altogether of an inferior order, and rarely went to the establishment of general principles. Possessing great natural endowments, eminent for their sound sense and knowledge of the resources of their art, and distinguished for their literary acquirements, it was to be expected that they would reach a high station in public estimation; but as they rarely employed physiological reasoning as the guide of their practice, they are not entitled to the first honours of the profession. Like mariners in the ancient times, they steered their course by direct observation of the coast, but dared not trust themselves, like modern navigators, to the abstract revelations of astronomy.

The character of Pott is well drawn by Mr. Ottley:—

“Pott was a man of great natural talents, and of sound sense, which had been improved and strengthened by a good classical education, and by constant assiduous attention on his own part in after life. As a surgeon, he was thoroughly versed in the history of medicine in all ages, and knew well how to bring this knowledge to bear on the practice of his profession. His correct observation enabled him to discover many of the errors of his predecessors, and his ingenuity and judgment to correct them; and thus, by the combined efforts of his own and others' experience, he was the means of introducing many valuable improvements into the practical departments of surgery. He was not fond of employing physiological reasoning to guide his practice, but aimed rather at founding his treatment on immediate analogy and induction from established facts, than on broader general principles. The theoretical part of our profession, therefore, he did little to improve. As an operator, Pott was eminently skilled; as a lecturer, clear, energetic, and fluent; as a writer, especially correct and elegant. In society he was agreeable, witty, and abounding in anecdote, and at the same time kind and gentlemanly in his manner. Though hospitable in his mode of living, he was prudent in regard to pecuniary matters; and though he commenced his profession poor, brought up a large family liberally, and left them well provided for at his death.

“The account already given of Hunter has sufficiently shown how

destitute he was of many of those acquirements which added lustre to the character of Pott, and which mainly contributed to obtain for him the high esteem which he so long and so deservedly enjoyed. But in spite of these deficiencies, Hunter, by the force of his own genius, which was unquestionably of a much higher order than that of Pott, and by his unwearied industry, forced his way at length to the summit of his profession; and, as Dr. Beddoes observed, 'when one heard that Hunter was at length the first surgeon in London, one felt a satisfaction like that which attends the distribution of poetical justice at the close of a well-told tale.'—p. 112.

It has been usual to compare Hunter with Cuvier, a comparison which, we are willing to admit, does honour to both parties. Their minds were equally comprehensive, their zeal equally ardent, their industry equally unremitting, and their impartiality and love of truth equally conspicuous. They both created new sciences—Hunter that of physiological surgery, Cuvier that of osteological geology; but as their pursuits were directed to different objects, it is difficult to institute a parallelism between them. To the pursuits of Hunter natural history was a subsidiary object; while to the zoological researches of Cuvier physiology was merely an accessory. The only ground common to them both was comparative anatomy, in which Hunter was unquestionably the superior. We perfectly agree in the observation recently made by Sir B. Brodie, in his Hunterian oration, that the descriptive prolegomena attached to the Hunterian catalogues, evince a power of generalization not inferior to that of Cuvier, and only require to be expanded by some accomplished writer to excel by many degrees the *Leçons d'Anatomie Comparée* of that author. The superior method and brilliant oratory of Cuvier rendered his talents more resplendent than those of Hunter, while, at the same time, he possessed the entire command of his own time, and the resources of a powerful nation. It is remarkable, however, that the foundations of his arrangement are precisely those which Hunter had previously adopted as those of his museum.

Sir Benjamin Brodie observes,—

"The study of comparative anatomy (that term being intended to designate the anatomy of animals generally, as contradistinguished from the anatomy of any single species) is of very ancient date. It is one of those many branches of science which occupied the comprehensive mind of Aristotle; and since the revival of the love of knowledge from the torpor of the dark ages, there have been always individuals who pursued it to a greater or less extent. But, up to the middle of the last century, these enquiries were carried on in a vague and desultory manner. A master mind was wanting, capable of grasping the entire subject; of analysing, combining, and arranging the apparently heterogeneous and discordant materials of which it is composed, and of exhibiting them in

their mutual relations, forming one harmonious system worthy of the creator of the universe. Those who attribute the glory of having first accomplished these objects to Cuvier, do great injustice to our own countryman. The labours of John Hunter preceded those of the French philosopher. In Cuvier's work on comparative anatomy, we find recorded an immense number and variety of facts connected with the structure of all kinds of animals; but we need only walk into the Museum of this College to see the facts themselves displayed by the hand of John Hunter, or under his immediate superintendence."—p. 15.

It appears to us, that the most proper subject of comparison with Hunter is Bichat; but there was a marked peculiarity in the natural and acquired endowments of these great men, which may be traced in a great measure to the differences of natural temperament by which they were distinguished. Hunter was less enthusiastic, less imaginative, than Bichat. His love of truth and innate caution of mind restrained those bold and rapid flights which distinguished the latter. He discriminated the differences, while the other marked only the resemblances of objects. His observation was more subtle and exact, his judgment more penetrating and profound, and his view more extended and comprehensive. Hunter's mind was massive in all its proportions, and his grasp of facts absolutely prodigious; so that he rarely failed to attain truth on those subjects which he made the objects of his investigation. He never suffered his love of truth to be warped by addiction to system, nor his love of applause to betray him into popular and superficial views, founded on the supposed harmonies of nature. Bichat, on the contrary, possessed a rapid and discursive mind, capable of embracing large views, and hitting out, with surprising facility, the conjectural analogies of things; his invention was wonderfully fertile, and his range of knowledge, apart from his professional pursuits, extensive and considerable. To these qualities he added the perfect command of a flowing and graceful style, which reacted on his mind, and often suggested new analogies and fresh topics of argument in the progress of his discussion; but his language is deficient in precision, his experiments are carelessly conducted, his observations are inexact, and his judgment is often superficial;—he is too frequently carried away with the love of system and the desire of applause. Hunter, from defect of style, constantly struggles for expression, and always appears to the least advantage. Bichat, on the contrary, always captivates by his manner, and places his argument in the best possible light. By the former, our judgment is informed, but by the latter our imagination is dazzled. The contrast, in short, is emphatically *national*—it is that of Wellington or Napoleon.

We shall conclude with one further extract from Mr. Lawrence,

the eloquence of which is a fitting accompaniment to so noble and elevating a theme:—

“ In conclusion, gentlemen, let me express to you my conviction, that as a physiologist and surgeon, John Hunter has had no equal in any age or country;—that he was one of those powerful minds, appearing only at long intervals, of which this island, small as it is, has produced so great a number;—that his name must be inscribed on that bright constellation of genius, which already bears those of Harvey and Sydenham, of Bacon, Locke, and Newton; of Shakspeare, Milton, Scott, and Byron. These gifted mortals, with kindred spirits, who have drawn inspiration from their example and works, shed over our land an intellectual glory, equal to its renown in arts and in arms. The bosom of every Englishman glows with an emotion of conscious pride at the enumeration of these revered names. If, gentlemen, the time should ever come, when the institutions and the power of our beloved country shall have passed away, their memory would linger round the spots consecrated by their earthly labours; the land on which they trod would still be a watchword to the earth; it would be peopled with the glorious recollections of its departed sages, as the sight of Greece recalled to the truly noble poet, who yielded up his life on her classic soil, the heroes who had fallen in her defence.

“ ‘ They fell (he says) devoted but undying;  
The very gale their names seemed sighing;  
The waters murmured of their name;  
The woods were peopled with their fame;  
The silent pillar, lone and grey,  
Claimed kindred with their sacred clay;  
Their spirit wrapp’d the dusky mountain;  
Their memory sparkled o’er the fountain;  
The meanest rill, the mightiest river,  
Rolled mingling with their fame for ever.’ ”—p. 38.

ART. II.—*Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion.* 2 vols. 8vo. By the Reverend Nicholas Wiseman, D.D. Booker, London. 1836.

“ ON many occasions,” says an illustrious Catholic writer of Germany, “ we must contemplate with regret, how that mighty England, in the eighteenth century, so brilliant and so powerful by the sway she exerted over the whole European mind, no longer seems to feel herself at home in the nineteenth century, nor to know where to find her place in the new order of things.”\* Indeed, the great intellectual inferiority of England

\* Schlegel’s “ *Philosophy of History*,” translated from the German, by J. B. Robertson, Esq., vol. ii. p. 310.

in the present age, seems to be pretty generally admitted by our countrymen themselves. While a large portion of France has been courageously shaking off the degrading trammels of materialism, and rising more and more into the pure regions of Christian philosophy,—while Germany, Catholic and Protestant, has been advancing with giant strides in every department of knowledge,—while even Italy begins to give no unequivocal symptoms of a great intellectual resuscitation,—in England, we regret to say, mediocrity and frivolity are the general characteristics of literature. In the higher regions of imagination, indeed, many stately trees, worthy of the best days of British growth, have sprung up to vindicate the ancient glory of our country; but in the more level fields of literature, the whole intellectual vegetation, as if choked and dried up by the flying sands of materialism, bears a languid, parched, and shrivelled look. That awful tempest, which marked the close of the eighteenth century, and which was a scourge sent forth by an offended Deity, to chastise and purify a guilty world,—a tempest which, in France, levelled with the dust the most sacred, valued, and venerable institutions, and whose ravages it will probably take half a century more to repair,—which, in more favoured Germany, (for that country felt only the tail of the hurricane,) while it destroyed some noxious abuses, left, comparatively speaking at least, the foundations of the social edifice unshaken;—that tempest rolled harmless by the shores of Britain: and thus it came to pass, that not only the great and immediate evil, but the remoter good, which, according to the mysterious laws of Providence, results from those great catastrophes, were alike unfelt by our country. Hence the philosophy of the last age, among a no inconsiderable portion of the British public, drags on a wretched, lingering existence; and, in a moral sense, we have too often occasion to remark, that the eighteenth century is not yet terminated in England. That the moral and intellectual regeneration of our country, however, may be accomplished without the terrible, and ever uncertain ordeal of a political revolution, is a prayer in which every Christian and patriotic Englishman must concur.

Among us, many important branches of literature, as ethnography and archæology, in which our continental neighbours have, during the last thirty years, made such rapid advances, are almost totally neglected; classical philology has too often degenerated into a mere verbal criticism, without life or spirit; the muse of history, except in a few brilliant instances, has been compelled to give place to that of memoir-writing; the natural sciences have remained devoid of mutual connexion, and of all

deeper purpose and signification; nor can we marvel at this decline of intellect, when we consider that philosophy, the queen of the sciences, has been deposed from her throne, and lies trampled in the dust. And how should philosophy herself possess any fecundity, or retain any portion of her dignity, divorced as she has long been from a sound theology?

The causes of this great debasement of British literature in our times, it is not difficult to trace. The small degree of patronage which, until lately, literary or scientific merit has received at the hands of government, and the want of those official honours and emoluments, which, in other countries, foster genius, and stimulate application; the inefficiency of our public Universities,\* in despite of the undeniable improvements which they have undergone within the last forty years,—an inefficiency which is in a great degree attributable to the predominance of the *tutorial* over the *professional* system of instruction; the great cost of education in those establishments, by which a large portion of the liberal youth of England are effectually excluded from all participation in their advantages; the monopoly of all higher instruction, which, until lately, they have enjoyed; the utter distaste of a large portion of the Protestant Dissenters, particularly the Quakers and the Methodists, for all polite literature and liberal knowledge; the long oppression, which cramped the intellectual energies of the British Catholics; the habits of fashionable frivolity and enervating luxury, which pervade the upper classes of society, habits which are so inimical to all sound discipline of the mind; the engrossing attention which commercial pursuits, and political affairs, and political discussions, claim and possess in this country; the passion for a sort of literary journalism, and the mania for epitomes, abridgments, and elementary books of all descriptions, and on all sorts of subjects, which has seized this unfortunate generation; the degrading influence of the philosophy of Locke, which has directed the English mind almost exclusively to the contemplation of *material* objects,—a philosophy which is the deadly foe to all the lofty aspirings of fancy, and to all the deeper searchings of thought; lastly, the progress of religious indifference, springing, as it does, out of the natural development of Protestant principles, and which, while it undermines the foundations of domestic happiness, and public morality, and social order, chills the feelings, deadens the imagination, and contracts and debases the understanding;—such are

---

\* We allude more particularly to Oxford and Cambridge, as the other Universities are of too recent an origin to have exercised any influence, one way or the other, upon our national literature.



the main causes to which we must ascribe the present fallen condition of British literature and British science. And yet, in no country is a strong manly sense more generally prevalent; in no country is the race of what are called *clever men* more abundant; in no country are the political institutions so well calculated to call forth the exercise of talent; in none, during the present age, have all the excitements which literary genius can receive from a nation's military prowess and glory been more abundantly furnished; but, owing to the causes above assigned, these advantages have been in a great measure weakened and neutralized.

We have been led into this course of reflections by the work now before us—a work which, we think, is destined to form an era in the history of our literature. The connexion of its author with this journal may seem to render some reserve necessary in our remarks, and to set a restraint on those terms of eulogy, which his production so justly merits; but when we consider the distance at which he is now removed from us, we trust we shall be excused, if we give some scope to our natural feelings of admiration. Dr. Wiseman has been for several years known in this country, and more particularly on the Continent, as a most able Hebrew and Syriac scholar, and as a learned, acute, and sagacious Biblical critic. But he was yet to give proof of all those higher qualities—of that brilliancy of fancy, originality of thought, and power of eloquence, united to the most fervent piety and the most amiable amenity of disposition, which, while they have endeared him to the British Catholics, have raised him to the first rank in the literature of his country.

It was in the healthful and bracing pursuits of philology and divinity, that the youthful mind of our author was long trained and exercised. Divinity, considered in itself, apart from the arid forms in which it is too often communicated, is certainly, by the importance and elevation of its matter, and by the many sciences subsidiary to it, a study more than any other calculated to ennoble the heart, exalt the fancy, and expand and invigorate the understanding. Philology, too, though an inferior, is a most excellent discipline of the mind; for not only is it the invaluable key to vast stores of knowledge, but, in a pre-eminent degree, it strengthens the memory, calls forth critical acumen, and, by requiring and stimulating assiduous application, renders every other study afterwards comparatively easy.

In the work before us, the impress of these two studies is very manifest. If theology has at once consecrated and directed our author's researches, at once proposed the term, and marked the limits, of his enquiries; philology, in her turn, has furnished him,

in a great many instances at least, with means and appliances for the prosecution of his task. The object of the present work is to prove that in science, as in every other department of human activity, the controul of an all-wise and all-loving Providence is visible; that out of evil He often causeth good to come; that all the efforts of perverse men to belie the word of His revelation, conduce only to His greater glory—the consolation of the just, and the humiliation of the wicked; that in the works of God there is no contradiction, nor even real discrepancy: that a perfect unity, a sublime harmony, pervades all his manifestations, whether as declared by external nature, or by the inward conscience, or as deposited in the word of his special revelation; that although the faith of God's righteous servants is often tried and tempted by the shadowy doubts which an apparently hostile science casts on his revelation; yet in his own good season, the Almighty causeth those doubts to be dispelled by the light of investigation; in fine, that experience teaches that every science, the more it is investigated, and, according to the nature and degree of affinity which it bears to religion, increases and confirms the evidences of divine revelation; and that thus the old adage of Bacon,—“A little knowledge leads men away from Christianity, but a great deal brings them back to it,” is signally confirmed by the voice of history, and the testimony of individual experience.

To say that a theme so noble, yet so arduous, has been worthily executed by our author, is to pronounce the highest eulogium on his work. The first characteristic of his book is, the admirable method with which, out of elements the most opposite, and even the most heterogeneous, he has produced an harmonious whole, and moulded subjects the most various, and even the most dissimilar, into one connected work. Thus philology, physiology, geology, chronology and early history, archæology and biblical criticism, successively come under review; yet so masterly is the author's talent of transition, that we pass from one subject to the other without scarcely perceiving the change; and while each of those sciences is made to adduce its testimony in illustration and confirmation of the truth of Holy Writ, the collective evidence of the whole, by the skilful arrangement of the parts, acquires additional force. The next quality of this work is, the vast and various learning which the author has brought to bear upon the subjects he treats—a learning always full, but never exuberant, and pervaded throughout by a spirit of the soundest criticism. Indeed the research which Dr. Wiseman has here displayed, is above all praise: the time, labour, and expense which the composition of such a book must have cost the writer, few will be able

to appreciate. In truth, from the extensive acquaintance here evinced with the living literature of the Continent, especially of Germany; from the frequent citation of writings almost inaccessible to the English scholar, such as foreign periodicals, detached essays, and transactions of foreign learned societies, we make bold to affirm that none but an Englishman, long resident on the Continent, could have been the author of this production. The last and higher characteristics of the work before us, are a sagacity of judgment, and an honesty of purpose, which no love of theory, however specious, not even the more laudable zeal for religion, can ever shake or suborn—a power of philosophic generalization, unhappily so rare in our country, and which can impart an interest to the most trifling, and a dignity to the most important, subjects; in fine, a style free, bold, and manly, and which rises at times to a lofty eloquence.

But it is now time to lay before our readers an analysis of the present work, interweaving in it, from time to time, our own observations. We shall also extract such passages as furnish favourable specimens of the author's research, mode of reasoning, and style.

He opens his subject in the following dignified manner:—

“Were it given unto us to contemplate God's works in the visible and in the moral world, not as we now see them, in shreds and little fragments, but as woven together into the great web of universal harmony; could our minds take in each part thereof with its general and particular connexions, relations, and appliances, there can be no doubt but religion, as established by Him, would appear to enter, and fit so completely and so necessarily into the general plan, as that all would be unravelled and destroyed, if by any means it should be withdrawn. And such a view of its interweaving with the whole economy and fabric of nature, would doubtless be the highest order of evidence which could be given us of its truth. But this is the great difference between nature's and man's operation, that she fashioneth and moulds all the parts of her works at once, while he can apply himself only to the elaboration of one single part at a time; and hence it comes, that in all our researches, the successive and partial attention which we are obliged to give to separate evidences or proofs, doth greatly weaken their collective force. For, as the illustrious Bacon hath well remarked, the harmony of the sciences, that is, when each part supports the other, is, and ought to be, the true and brief way of confutation and suppression of all the smaller sort of objections; but on the other hand, if you draw out every axiom, like the sticks of a faggot, one by one, you may easily quarrel with them, and bend and break them at your pleasure.\*

“To the difficulties thus thrown in our way by the limitation of our faculties, prejudices of venerable standing have added much. For ages it

---

\* Bacon, *De Augm. Scient.* l. vii. p. 330.

has been considered by many useless and almost profane to attempt any marriage between theology and the other sciences. Some men in their writings, and many in their discourse, go so far as to suppose that they may enjoy a dualism of opinions, holding one set which they believe as Christians, and another whereof they are convinced as philosophers. Such a one will say that he believes the Scriptures, and all that they contain; but will yet uphold some system of chronology or history, which can nowise be reconciled therewith. One does not see how it is possible to make accordance between the Mosaic creation and Cuvier's discoveries; another thinks the history of the dispersion incompatible with the number of dissimilar languages now existing; a third considers it extremely difficult to explain the origin of all mankind from one common parentage. So far therefore from considering religion, or its science, theology, as entitled to sisterhood with the other sciences, it is supposed to move on a distinct plane, and preserve a perpetual parallelism with them, which prevents them all from clashing, as it deprives them of mutual support. Hence, too, it is no wonder that theology should be always considered a study purely professional, and devoid of general interest; and that it should be deemed impossible to invest its researches with those varied charms that attract us to other scientific enquiries.

"Reflections such as these have led me to the attempt whereupon I enter to-day,—the attempt that is to bring theology somehow into the circle of the other sciences, by showing how beautifully it is illustrated, supported, and adorned by them all; to prove how justly the philosopher should bow to her decisions, with the assurance that his researches will only confirm them; to demonstrate the convergence of truths revealed with truths discovered; and, however imperfectly, to present you with some such picture as Homer hath described upon his hero's shield, of things and movements heavenly, that appertain unto a higher sphere, hemmed round and embellished by the representation of earthlier and homelier pursuits.

"My purpose, therefore, in the course of lectures to which I have invited you, is to show the correspondence between the progress of science and the developement of the Christian evidences; and before proceeding farther, I must be allowed to explain the terms and limits of my enquiries. By the simple statement of my theme, it will be seen that I do not intend to enter upon the well-occupied field of natural theology, or to apply the progress of science to the increasing proof thereby gained of a wise all-ruling Providence. It is of revealed religion alone that I mean to treat; of the evidences which Christianity has received in its numberless connexions with the order of nature, or the course of human events. And when I use the word evidences, I must be understood in a very wide and general signification. I consider that whatever tends to prove the truth of any narrative in the sacred volume, especially if that narrative, to merely human eyes, appears improbable, or irreconcilable with other facts, tends also essentially to increase the sum of evidence which Christianity possesses, resting, as it essentially does, upon the authenticity of that book. Any discovery, for instance, that a trifling date, till lately inexplicable, is quite correct, besides the

satisfaction it gives upon an individual point, has a far greater moral weight in the assurance it affords of security in other matters ; and hence a long research, which will lead to a discovery of apparently mean importance, must be measured according to this general influence, rather than by its immediate results."—vol. i. p. 3-7.

We have not hesitated to lay, this long extract before our readers, as it furnishes them with a key to the whole purport of these volumes.

The first two lectures are devoted to Ethnography, or comparative philology,—a field of literature little explored or cultivated in this country, but abounding with matter of the highest interest for the philosopher and the historian. This science has only within the last thirty years attained to any degree of consistence—it has been hitherto without an historian ; and therefore the materials out of which our author has drawn his very interesting account of the rise and progress of this study lay scattered and far apart. In no portion of his work has Dr. Wiseman, we think, displayed a more praiseworthy sagacity, and a more perseverant spirit of research. After speaking of the opposite theories proposed by Christian and infidel philologists and philosophers respecting the origin of language, he gives the following interesting sketch of the infancy of philological pursuits :—

"The history of the comparative study of languages presents the same features in the moral sciences, which chemistry does among physical pursuits. While the latter was engaged in a fruitless chase of the philosopher's stone, or a remedy for every disease, the linguists were occupied in the equally fruitless search after the primary language. In the course of both enquiries, many important and unexpected discoveries were doubtless made : but it was not till a principle of analytical investigation was introduced in both, that the real nature of their objects was ascertained, and results obtained far more valuable than had first caused and encouraged so much toilsome application.

"The desire of verifying the Mosaic history, or the ambition of knowing the language first communicated by divine inspiration, was the motive or impulse of the old linguists' chimerical research. For it was argued, if it can only be shown that there exists some language, which contains, as it were, the germ of all the rest, and forms a centre whence all others visibly diverge, then the confusion of Babel receives a striking confirmation ; for that language must have been once the common speech of mankind.

"But here such a host of rivals entered the lists, and their conflicting pretensions were advanced with such assurance, or such plausibility, as rendered a satisfactory decision perfectly beyond hope.

"The Celtic language found a zealous patron in the learned Pezron :\* the claims of the Chinese were warmly advocated by Webb, and by

---

\* "*Antiquité de la nation et de la langue des Celtes.*" Par. 1704.

several other writers.\* Even in our own times—for the race of such visionaries is not yet extinct—Don Pedro de Astarloa, Don Thomas de Sorreguieta, and the Abbé d'Harce-Bidassouet-d'Aroztegui, have taken the field as champions of the Biscayan, with equal success as in former times: the very erudite and unwieldy Goropius Becanus, brought up his native Low Dutch as the language of the terrestrial Paradise.†

"Notwithstanding these ambitious pretensions, the Semitic languages as they are called, that is, the languages of Western Asia, seemed to be the favoured claimants; but, alas! even here there was rivalry among the sisters. The Abyssinians boasted their language to be the mother stock, from which even Hebrew had sprung; a host of Syriac authors traced the lincal descent of their speech through Heber, from Noah and Adam: but Hebrew was the pretender that collected the most numerous suffrages in its favour. From the antiquities of Josephus, and the Targums or Chaldec Paraphrases of Onkelos, and of Jerusalem, down to Anton in 1800, Christians and Jews considered its pretensions as almost definitively decided; and names of the highest rank in literature, Lipsius, Scaliger, Bochart, and Vossius, have trusted the truth of many of their theories to the certainty of this opinion.

"The learned and judicious Molitor, however, who has brought an immense store of Rabbinical literature to bear upon the demonstration of the Catholic religion, which he has embraced, acknowledges that the Jewish tradition, which makes Hebrew the language of the first Patriarchs, and even of Adam, is, in its literal sense, inadmissible; though, he adds, very judiciously, it is sufficient to acknowledge the inspiration of the Bible, for us to be obliged to confess that the language in which it is written is a faithful, though earthly image of the speech of Paradise; even as fallen man preserves some traces of his original greatness."‡—vol. i. pp. 14-17,

Our author remarks two defects in the method pursued by these early philologers. The first is, that they sought everywhere for a filiation of languages, and never seemed to imagine the possibility of the parallel descent of tongues from a common stock. This defect arose, we think, partly from the confined circle of their philological attainments, and partly from the impatience natural to men who, possessed with one idea, that of discovering the primitive language; grasped at any verbal analogy, however remote, which chance might throw in their way. The second defect of these linguists, as pointed out by our author, was the total neglect of comparative, and the exclusive attention given to derivative, etymology. Of this practice he gives an amusing example:—"Jennings," says he, "in his Jewish Antiquities, derives the Greek *ασυλον*, *asylum*, from the

\* "Essay on the probability that the Language of China is the Primitive Language." London, 1669. "The Antiquity of China; or an Historical Essay endeavouring a probability that the language of China is the primitive Language." Ib. 1678.

† "Origines Antwerpianæ." Antv. 1669, p. 534.

‡ "Philosophie der Geschichte, oder über die Tradition."

Hebrew word *eshel*, an oak or grove, in spite of the simple etymology given it by the ancients, α, *privativum*, and σιλω, forming together the signification of *inviolable*."

But independently of these theorists, there was a class of men whose unpretending labours were then laying the sure foundations for the future success of this science. These were the early travellers, who sometimes inserted in their works short vocabularies of the nations they visited; and still more the missionaries, who often published dictionaries and grammars of the various dialects spoken by the barbarous or savage tribes in whose conversion they were engaged. These works inspired some men with the idea of publishing collections of the Lord's Prayer, not only in all the polite languages of the ancient and modern world, but in all the barbarous and savage dialects, which the labours of these travellers and missionaries had brought under their notice. One of the earliest, and the most important of these compilations, was that made by Gesner in the year 1555, and entitled *Mithridates*: but this and subsequent collections were eclipsed by the more extensive series of the "Our Fathers," published at Amsterdam, by Wilkins and Chamberlayne, in the year 1715.

This date brings us to a period, when, thanks to the sagacity of the immortal Leibnitz, the study of languages was raised to the rank of a science. After an eloquent eulogium on the services rendered by this profound and comprehensive intellect to many and various departments of learning, our author observes, "that so far as the mere comparison of words can go, Leibnitz must be admitted to have proposed the first sound principles; nay, there is hardly an analogy announced by the followers of that comparative system in modern times, which he has not somewhere anticipated; several of his hopes have been fulfilled, many of his conjectures verified."\*

In the course of the eighteenth century, the materials for this interesting science were greatly increased. The Empress Catherine II planned and conducted herself a work on comparative philology. In Italy, the valuable researches of the laborious Jesuit Hervas added vastly to the store of known vocabularies. In France, the more brilliant labours of the Persian scholar

---

\* In the present advanced state of comparative philology, it is pleasing to see how clearly this great genius foretold, more than one hundred and thirty years ago, the important results which our age has obtained from that science. "Je trouve," says he, "que rien ne sert davantage à juger des connexions des peuples que les langues. Par exemple, la langue des Abyssins nous fait connaître qu'ils sont une colonie d'Arabes."—Lettre au P. Verjus. *Leibnitzii Opera*, t. vi. p. 227, "Quam nihil majorem ad antiquas populorum origines indagandas lucem præbeat, quam collatio linguarum," &c.—*Desiderata circa linguas populorum*. ib. p. 228. Lacroze and Reiland, observes Dr. Wiseman, take the same view of this study.

Anquitol du Perron, and of the great Chinese scholars, De Guignes, and afterwards Deshautesayes, rendered nearly as much service to philological as to historical science; while the establishment of the British Asiatic Society at Calcutta in 1784, forms an era in the history of philology, and is certainly one of the events that has exercised the most marked influence, not only on the linguistic, but on the archæological, mythologic, and philosophical labours of the nineteenth century. It is just, however, to observe that the labours of this learned society had been in some degree anticipated by the worthy ecclesiastic, Father Paulinus, a Sancto Bartholomæo, who, under the auspices of the Roman Propaganda, "published a series of works on Sanskrit Grammar, and on the history and religion of the Hindoos;" and whose services to Indian literature have, in our times, been duly appreciated by the illustrious orientalist, Abel-Rémusat.\* But the work to which, more than to any other yet named, ethnographic science has been indebted, and which indeed has, in our times, shaped the course of philological study, is the splendid work published in 1806 by Adelung, and entitled *Mithridates*. This work was ably continued by Dr. Vater, and the younger Adelung, and in its complete form embraces the languages of Asia, Europe, America, and Africa, not classified according to alphabetical order, but grouped according to families.

Having thus, after our author, brought down the history of comparative philology to the commencement of the present century, it is time to examine the present state of the science, and to consider (what indeed is the principal object of these enquiries) the illustrations and evidences which it furnishes of the truth of the Scripture narrative. The interest and importance of the subject, as well as the ability with which it is treated, will, we trust, be a sufficient apology for the length of the following citation:—

"You have seen then how, at the close of the last century, the numberless languages gradually discovered seemed to render the probability of mankind having originally possessed a common tongue, much smaller than before; while the dissolution of certain admitted connexions and analogies among those previously known, seemed to deny all proof from comparative analogy, of their having separated from a common stock. Every new discovery only served to increase this perplexity; and our science must at that time have presented to a religious observer, the appearance of a study daily receding from sound doctrine, and giving encouragement to rash speculations and dangerous conjecture. But even at that period, a ray of light was penetrating into the chaos of materials thrown together by collectors, and the first great step towards a new

---

\* See his "Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques," t. ii. p. 305.



organization, was even then taken by the division of those materials into distinct homogeneous masses; into continents, as it were, and oceans; the stable and circumscribed, and the moveable and varying elements, whereof this science is now composed.

"The affinities which formerly had been but vaguely seen between languages separated in their origin by history and geography, began now to appear definite and certain. It was now found that new and most important connexions existed among languages, so as to combine in large provinces or groups, the idioms of nations whom no other research would have shown to be mutually related. It was found that the Teutonic dialects received considerable light from the language of Persia, that Latin had remarkable points of contact with Russian and the other Slavonian idioms, and that the theory of the Greek verbs in  $\mu$ , could not well be understood without recourse to their parallels in Sanskrit or Indian grammar. In short, it was clearly demonstrated that one speech, essentially so called, pervaded a considerable portion of Europe and Asia, and, stretching across in a broad sweep from Ceylon to Iceland, united in a bond of union nations professing the most irreconcilable religions, possessing the most dissimilar institutions, and bearing but a slight resemblance in physiognomy and colour. The language, or rather family of languages, I have thus lightly sketched, has received the name of Indo-Germanic, or Indo-European. As this group is necessarily to us the most interesting, and has received the most cultivation, I will describe it more at length, confining myself to a few passing observations upon other families. But in tracing the history of this one, you will be fully enabled to see how every new investigation tends still farther to correct the dangerous tendencies of the earlier periods of our science.

"The great members of this family are the Sanskrit, or ancient and sacred language of India; the Persian, ancient and modern, formerly considered a Tartar dialect; Teutonic, with its various dialects, Slavonian, Greek, and Latin, accompanied by its numerous derivatives. To these, as we shall later see, must now be added the Celtic dialects, the enumeration I have made being intended to embrace only the languages early admitted into this species of confederation. By casting your eyes over the ethnographic map which I present you,\* you will at once see the territory thus occupied; that is, the whole of Europe, excepting only the small tracts held by the Biscayan and by the Finnish family, which includes Hungarian; thence it extends over a great part of Southern Asia, here and there interrupted by insulated groups. It were tedious, indeed, to enumerate the writers who have proved the affinity between the languages I have named, or between two or more members thereof: it will be sufficient for our purpose, if I explain rather the methods they have pursued, and the results they have obtained.

"The first and most obvious mode of proceeding, and the one which first led to these interesting conclusions, was that of which I have often spoken,—the comparison of words in these different languages. Many

---

\* A valuable Map, tracing the different families of language, is prefixed to vol. i. of the Lectures.

works have presented comparative tables to a very great extent : that of Colonel Vans Kennedy comprises nine hundred words common to Sanskrit and other languages.\* The words found thus to resemble one another in different idioms are by no means such as could have been communicated by subsequent intercourse ; but express the first and simplest elements of language,—primary ideas such as must have existed from the beginning, and scarcely ever change their denominations. Not to cite the numerals, which would require many accompanying observations, while I pronounce the following words,—*pader, mader, sunu, dokhter, brader, mand, vidhava*, or *juvan*, you might easily suppose that I was repeating words from some European language, yet every one of these terms is either Sanskrit or Persian. Again, to chuse another class of simple words, in such words as *asthi* (Gr. ὀστέον), a bone ; *denta*, a tooth, *eyumen*, the eye, in Zend ; *brouwa* (Ger. braue), eye-brow ; *nasa*, the nose ; *lib*, a lip ; *karu* (Gr. χεῖρ), a hand ; *genu*, the knee : *ped*, the foot ; *hrti*, the heart ; *jecur*, the liver : or again, *staru*, a star ; *gela*, cold ; *aghi* (Lat. ignis), fire ; *dhara* (terra), the earth ; *arrivi*, a river ; *nau* (Gr. ναῦς), a ship ; *ghau*, a cow ; *sarpam*, a serpent ; you might easily fancy that you heard dialects of languages much nearer home ; and yet they all belong to the Asiatic languages I have already mentioned. So far indeed may this comparison be carried, that fanciful etymologists like Von Hammer, will derive such pure English words as *bed-room*, from the Persian.

“But this verbal coincidence would have proved by no means satisfactory to a large body of philologists, had it not in due course been followed by a still more important conformity in the grammatical structure of these languages. Bopp, in 1816, was the first to examine this subject with any degree of accuracy ; and by a minute and sagacious analysis of the Sanskrit verb, compared with the conjugational system of the other members of this family, left no farther doubt of their intimate and primitive affinity ; since which time he has pushed his researches much farther, and commenced the publication of a more extensive work.†

“By the analysis of the Sanskrit pronouns, the elements of those existing in all the other languages are cleared of their anomalies ; the verb substantive, which in Latin is composed of fragments referable to two distinct roots, here finds both existing in regular form : the Greek conjugations, with all their complicated machinery of middle voice, augment, and reduplications, are here found and illustrated in a variety of ways, which a few years ago would have appeared chimerical. Even our own language may sometimes receive light from the study of distant members of our family : Where, for instance, are we to seek the root of our comparative *better* ? Certainly not in its positive *good*, nor in the Teutonic dialects, in which the same anomaly exists. But in the Persian we have precisely the same comparative *behter*, with exactly the same signification regularly formed from its positive *beh*, good, just as we have

\* “Researches into the origin and affinity of the principal languages of Asia and Europe.” London, 1828. The tables are to be found at the end of the work.

† “Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litauischen, Gothisch. und Deutschen.” Berlin, 1833.

in the same language *badter*, worse, from its positive *bad*."—vol. i. pp. 39-44.

The Indo-European family of languages, already so extensive, receives with every new advance of our science, new and important accessions. Thus the Armenian, which Frederick Schlegel had formerly considered an intermediate language, has been proved by Klaproth to be a member of this great family.\* The Afghan, also, this scholar has shown to be entitled to the same right of incorporation.† But the last and most considerable addition to this family, is that of the Celtic languages, with their numerous dialects. This truth has been fully established by an English scholar, who by the learning, industry, and spirit of critical enquiry which he has brought into ethnographic science, forms a noble exception from the present race of British philologists.‡ The Celtic is shown to confer much benefit on the family into which it has been admitted, many parts of its structure explaining what was obscure in the organization of the kindred languages.

Thus much for the Indo-European languages. The close relationship between all the members of the Semitic race—the Hebrew, Syro-Chaldaic, Arabic, and Gheez or Abyssinian tongues, is passed over by our author, as a truth universally admitted. Turning to languages less known, and which have hitherto undergone little philological investigation, he shows from the testimony of Dr. Leyden, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Marsden, that one uniform structure pervades all the languages spoken throughout the Indian Archipelago; and to these he has assigned the generic name of *Polynesian*. He seems also persuaded that between this extensive family and the Transgannetic race of tongues, close ties of affinity subsist. Thus do we see that every farther research tends to diminish the number of independent languages. This portion of the enquiry we shall close in the author's own words.

"While the Indo-European family (says he) is thus gradually more rounded as well as increased in its territorial limits, and the number of its members daily increases, other languages, the connexions whereof were not formerly known, have been found allied to others separated by considerable tracts of country, so nearly as to form with them a common family. I will content myself with one instance in Europe. Towards the close of the last century, Sainovic, followed by Gyarmathi, proved that Hungarian, which lies like an island surrounded by Indo-European languages, belongs essentially to the Finnish or Uralian family, which

\* *Asia Polyglotta*, p. 99.

† *Ibid*, p. 57.

‡ See Dr. Prichard, "On the Eastern origin of the Celtic Nations." Oxford, 1831. This work has received a high eulogium from Dr. Wiseman.

stretches downwards, as it were, through the Esthonian and Livonian, to join it.\* In Africa, too, the dialects whereof have been comparatively but little studied, every new research displays connexions between tribes extended over vast tracks, and often separated by intermediate nations; in the north, between the languages spoken by the Berbers and Tuariks, from the Canaries to the Oasis of Siwa; in central Africa, between the dialects of the Felatahs and Foulas, who occupy nearly the whole interior; in the south, among the tribes across the whole continent from Caffria and Mozambique to the Atlantic Ocean."—pp. 61-2.

Dr. Wiseman closes the first lecture with one of those magnificent perorations, which so often conclude his discourses.

We are at a loss which most to admire—the lofty reflections, the dignified eloquence, or the beautiful piety which pervades the passage. We regret that our limits will not permit us to cite it.

Having proved that all languages may be divided into certain great families, our author proceeds to examine whether any and what relation can be found between these different families. But before entering on this investigation, he deems it necessary to give an account of the present state of philological science in Europe.

"The principal ethnographers of modern times," says he, "may be divided into two classes; one whereof seeks the affinity of languages in their words, the other in their grammar; their methods may be respectively called, *lexical* and *grammatical* comparison. The chief supporters of the first method are principally to be found in France, England, and Russia: such as Klaproth, Balbi, Abel-Rémusat, Whiter, Vans Kennedy, Gaulianoff, the younger Adelung, and Merian. In Germany, Von Hammer, and perhaps Frederick Schlegel,† might be considered as of the same school. The principle followed by these writers may perhaps be summed up in the observation made somewhere by Klaproth, that 'words are the stuff or matter of language, and grammar its fashioning or form.' . . . The other class is confined in a great measure to Germany, and reckons A. W. von Schlegel, and the lamented Baron W. von Humboldt, among its most distinguished chiefs."—vol. i. p. 71.

If the first class of ethnographers has too often perplexed or disfigured the science by fanciful etymologies, the latter, notwithstanding its pretensions to superior circumspection, has sometimes fallen into similar excesses; and when the illustrious A. W. von Schlegel asserts that "the common use of a *privativum* proves more for the affinity of Greek and Sanscrit, than some hundreds of words," this is one of those exaggerations into which a man may be hurried from a dislike of an opposite extreme. Here

---

\* See the Ethnographic Map prefixed to vol. 1st.

† Frederick Schlegel, we think, combined the two systems.

follows a most ingenious and interesting disquisition to prove that language is not susceptible of internal developement—that grammatical forms are as perfect, and even still more perfect in the earlier, than in the later stages of language; that the lexicon and the grammar of tongues, under *ordinary circumstances* and in *essential matters*, never vary. Extraordinary examples are, however, adduced by our author, where either by the effect of conquest, or of commerce, or by the pressure of peculiar circumstances, a nation has adopted the grammatical structure of a foreign language, and yet retained its own vernacular idiom. Thus it is observed, “the Anglo-Saxon lost its grammar by the Norman conquest, and the Italian sprang out of the Latin, more by the adoption of a new grammatical system, than by any change in words.”

Dr. Wiseman, who we believe is the first writer that has traced the history of comparative philology, brings down his account to the latest advance which the science has made, and by which we happily discover the secret connexion between some families of tongues, hitherto thought to be insulated. At this point of his investigations he has availed himself of the inedited labours of Dr. Lepsius, for which he was indebted to the kindness of the learned Chevalier Bunsen, the Prussian Envoy at Rome. Dr. Lepsius, of Berlin, published in 1834, a work entitled, “*Paläographie als ein Mittel der Sprachforschung*,”\* and which our author declares to be full of the most curious and original researches. By means of this new element Lepsius has established several very ingenious and striking resemblances between Sanscrit and Hebrew, so as to leave no doubt, according to his own expression, of the existence of a common, though undeveloped germ in both.

Encouraged by the success of this his first undertaking, Lepsius has betaken himself to the study of the Coptic, which has hitherto been deemed an isolated tongue, in order to discover a connexion between it and other languages. In the prosecution of this undertaking, he has been aided by the liberality of the Prussian government; and Dr. Wiseman has given to the public the interesting letters on the progress of his philological researches, addressed by Lepsius to the Chevalier Bunsen. We regret that want of space will not permit us to lay before our readers these highly instructive documents, and we can do no more than state the general result of this able scholar's investigations. He has in the first place established the identity, in all

---

\* “*Paläographie als Mittel für die Sprachforschung zunächst am Sanskrit nachgelesen.*” Berlin, 1834.

essential points, between the Coptic and the old Egyptian. Secondly, he has proved the close affinity between the Coptic and the Semitic pronouns; and the remarkable agreement between the numerals in the Coptic, and in the Indo-Germanic as well as Semitic families of language. Thirdly, his enquiries seem to have convinced him more and more of the connexion between the Semitic, and the Demotic and Hieroglyphic alphabets of Egypt; and lastly, he observes, that while the Coptic language bears strong traits of individuality, it possesses at the same time many points of resemblance to the Coptic, Semitic and the Indo-Germanic families, and may indeed be considered an intermediate member.

The important results accruing to the cause of revealed religion from this last discovery in the science of comparative philology, must be obvious to every reader. From this essential resemblance between all languages, and the greater or lesser marks of diversity which they present, the original unity of language, and consequently of mankind, as well as a sudden disrapture occasioned by some violent revolution, seems to follow as a necessary consequence; and the clue to the understanding of these mysterious events is furnished by the Bible.

Having reached this point in the history of the science under consideration, we must let our eloquent author state the general results in his own masterly language.

“And here let us look back for a moment at the connexion between our study and the sacred records. From the simple historical outline which I have laid before you, it appears that its first rise seemed fitter to inspire alarm than confidence, insomuch that it broke insunder the great bond anciently supposed to hold them altogether; then for a time it went on, still farther severing and dismembering, consequently to all appearance ever widening the breach between itself and Sacred History. In its farther progress it began to discover new affinities where least expected; till, by degrees, many languages began to be grouped and classified in large families, acknowledged to have a common origin. Then new enquiries gradually diminished the number of independent languages, and extended in consequence the dominion of the larger masses. At length, when this field seemed almost exhausted, a new class of researches has succeeded, so far as it has been tried, in proving the extraordinary affinities between these families; affinities existing in the very character and essence of each language, so that none of them could have ever existed without those elements, wherein the resemblances consist. Now as this excludes all idea of one having borrowed them from the other, as they could not have arisen in each by independent processes, and as the radical difference among the languages forbids their being considered dialects or offshoots from one another, we are driven to the conclusion that, on the one hand, these languages must have been originally united in one, whence they drew these common

elements essential to them all; and, on the other, that the separation between them, which destroyed other no less important elements of resemblance, could not have been caused by any gradual departure, or individual developement—for these we have long since excluded—but by some violent, unusual, and active force, sufficient alone to reconcile these conflicting appearances, and to account at once for the resemblances and the differences. It would be difficult methinks to say, what farther step the most insatiable or unreasonable sceptic could require, to bring the results of this science into close accordance with the scriptural account.”—vol. i. pp. 102-4.

In support of these views, our author adduces the testimony of many of the most distinguished philologists of the age. The two Barons von Humboldt, the Councillor Merian, Klaproth, Frederick Schlegel, Herder, Abel-Rémusat, Niebuhr, and Balbi, are successively called up as witnesses to corroborate the author's statements, receiving each in his turn the due meed of praise. We regret our limits will not permit us to transcribe the just and touching tribute to the memory of the Baron William von Humboldt. Another name dear to the scholar and the Christian, receives the following eloquent homage:—

“With greater pleasure still, I proceed to record the sentiments of the lamented Frederick Schlegel, a man to whom our age owes more than our children's children can repay—new and purer feelings upon art, and its holiest applications; the attempt, at least, to turn Philosophy's eye inward upon the soul, and to compound the most sacred elements of its spiritual powers with the ingredients of human knowledge; above all, the successful discovery of a richer India than Vasco de Gama opened unto Europe, whose value is not in its spices, and its pearls, and its Barbaric gold, but in tracks of science unexplored—in mines long unwrought, of native wisdom—in treasures deeply buried, of symbolic learning—and in monuments long hidden, of primeval and venerable traditions.”—vol. i. p. 109.

Dr. Wiseman concludes his second lecture with an inquiry into the languages of America—a subject still involved in considerable obscurity. Some timid friends of Revelation, he declares, have had such anxiety on this matter, that he has known them “to refuse credit to Humboldt's assertions regarding the number of American languages, rather than admit what they deemed an almost insuperable objection to the Scripture narrative.” These chimerical apprehensions he has dissipated, by showing, from the testimony of the most able philologists, that an uniform grammatical structure pervades all the languages of the American continent; that they are in the next place clearly divisible into certain great groups or families, like the languages of the Old World; and thirdly, that their multiplicity is to be ascribed to certain physical causes, and still more to the general prevalence of the

savage life, which, by impeding population, dispersing tribes, and insulating men one from the other, experience has shown, not only in America, but in Asia and Australia, constantly to produce an endless variety of dialects and idioms.

The subject of American languages leads our author into an interesting digression, on the origin of the American population. The uniform traditions of the American tribes—the perfect resemblance between the American zodiac and that of the Chinese, Japanese, Monguls, Tibetans, and Indians (a resemblance which could by no possibility be the result of accident)—and lastly, the traditions of the Americans on the primitive history of mankind, the deluge, and the dispersion, are brought forward as proofs of the descent of the inhabitants of the New World from Eastern Asia—the region of the globe where civilization attained its earliest development.

The concluding pages of this lecture, wherein the spiritual destination of the several families of tongues is pointed out—the admirable adaptation of the Semitic for the prophetic ministry of the elder dispensation, and that of the Indo-European for the diffusion, the defence, and scientific development of the new,—these concluding pages are, we think, for power of reflection and dignity of style, unsurpassed in the whole compass of our literature.

The copious analysis, which, from the novelty and interest of the subject, we have deemed it necessary to give of the first two lectures, compels us entirely to pass over the following on the natural history of man, and on geology, though in the importance of the matter, and the attractive form in which it is presented, the latter lectures, especially those on geology, are scarcely inferior to the former, which have just come under our consideration. Suffice it to remark, that they are characterized throughout by the same various and extensive learning; the same solidity of judgment; the same ingenuity and originality of observation. The prelections on geology we strongly recommend to the attention of the naturalist and of the divine, as containing admirable elucidations of the obscurities which yet involve the connexion of some parts of this science with the Mosaic narrative; while to the general reader, the subject is rendered interesting by a clear exposition of facts, and a lively eloquence.

The seventh lecture, which opens the second volume, commences with an elaborate disquisition on the Indian astronomy, where, from internal evidence and historical testimony, the antiquity once attributed to the Hindoo astronomical tables is shown to be utterly groundless. In this opinion concur the most able mathematicians and the most learned philologists of the age



Bentley, Colebrooke, Davis, Delambre, Schaubach, Laplace, Maskelyne, Heeren, Cuvier, and Klaproth. Let it be observed, too, that among the writers here named, are some whose anti-Mosaic opinions naturally inclined them in favour of the prodigious antiquity ascribed to the Indian astronomy; and that, therefore, their rejection of such a theory must be considered as extorted by an overpowering evidence. We can spare room only to state the general result of this enquiry in the words of Klaproth. "*Les tables astronomiques des Hindous, auxquelles on avait attribué une antiquité prodigieuse, ont été construites dans le septième siècle de l'ère vulgaire, et ont été postérieurement reportées par des calculs à un époque antérieure.*"\*

From the Indian astronomy, the author proceeds to the Indian chronology, and shows that the researches on this subject, conducted by Sir William Jones, Major Wilford, Mr. Bentley, and Professor Heeren, though directed towards different sources, concur in giving the same result. Hereby it is rendered probable that the highest point to which the historical antiquity of India can reach, is about the year 2,000 before Christ, or the age of Abraham. This result is also confirmed by the recent and valuable work of Colonel Tod, entitled, "*Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*;" as the following interesting passage will show:—

"The two principal races, as I before observed, are those of the Sun and Moon; and it is remarkable that the number of princes in the two lines, through the entire descent, preserves a tolerable proportion. Now, assuming the Boodha to be, what seems not unlikely, the regeneration of mankind after the deluge, as he is the beginning of the lunar line of princes, we should have, according to the genealogical tables, 'fifty-five princes from Boodha to Crishna and Youdishtra (I quote Col. Tod's own words); and, admitting an average of twenty years for each reign, a period of eleven hundred years; which being added to a like period calculated from thence to Vicramaditya, who reigned fifty-six years before Christ, I venture to place the establishment in India Proper, of these two grand races, distinctively called those of Soorya and Chandra, at about 2,256 years before the Christian era; at which period, though somewhat later, the Egyptian, Chinese, and Assyrian monarchies are generally stated to have been established, and about a century and a half after that great event, the Flood.† Thus far, certainly, there is nothing to excite a moment's uneasiness; and if we take the chronology of the Septuagint, which many moderns are disposed to follow, we have even an ampler period between that scourge and the epoch here allotted to the establishment of these royal houses."—vol. ii. p. 42-3.

\* "*Mémoires relatifs à l'Asie*," p. 397.

† "*Annals of Rajasthan*," vol. i. p. 37.

From the Indian chronology, the author passes to that of the Persians, and of the Georgians and Armenians. Among the former of these nations, authentic history, according to Klaproth,\* hardly ascends beyond the accession of the Sassanides to the throne, in the year of our Lord 227. Among the latter, native history, according to the same authority, cannot be traced farther back than two or three centuries before Christ; their early annals being made up entirely from the sacred Scriptures, and from the records of foreign nations. The same may be said of the Mahometan nations of Asia. But there is another great country of Asia, whose chronology invites attention; and on this subject it will be as well to hear our author.

"But we still have China to dispose of; and surely it at least must be excepted from the remarks which I have made. For it possesses a native literature, of great antiquity, and pretends to be the first or primary nation of the globe." \* \* \* \*

"According to Klaproth, the earliest historian of China was its celebrated philosopher and moralist, Confucius.† He is said to have drawn up the annals of his country, known under the name of Chu-King, from the days of Yao, till his own times. Confucius is supposed to have lived about four or five hundred years before Christ, and the era of Yao is placed at 2,557 years before the same era. Thus then we have upwards of 2000 years between the first historian and the earliest event which he records. But this antiquity, however remote, did not satisfy the pride of the Chinese; and later historians have prefixed other reigns to that of Yao, which stretched back to the venerable antiquity of three million two hundred and seventy-six thousand years before Christ.

"That you may estimate still more accurately the authenticity of the Chinese annals, I must not omit to state, that two hundred years after the death of Confucius, the Emperor Chi-Hoangti of the dynasty of Tsin, proscribed the works of the philosopher, and ordered all the copies of them to be destroyed. The Chu-King, however, was recovered, in the following dynasty of Han, from the dictation of an old man, who had retained it by memory. Such then is the origin of historical science in China; and in spite of all due veneration for the great moralist of the East, and of respect for his assertion, that he only wrought on materials already existing, Klaproth does not hesitate to deny the existence of historical certainty in the Celestial empire, earlier than 782 years before Christ, pretty nearly the era of the foundation of Rome, when Hebrew literature was already on the decline.‡

"The Japanese in historical knowledge are but the copiers of the

\* "Examen des Historiens Asiatiques."

† Ibid.

‡ P. 406.—"Abel-Rémusat is disposed to allow Chinese history to reach back to the year 2,200 before Christ, and plausible tradition to go as far back as 2,637. Even this antiquity presents nothing formidable to a Christian's convictions.—'Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques,' t. i. p. 61. Par. 1829."

Chinese. They, too, pretend to their millions of years before the Christian era. But the first portion of their annals is purely mythological; the second presents us with the Chinese dynasties as reigning in Japan; and it is not till the accession of the Dairi to the throne, only 660 years before Christ, that any dependance can be placed upon their records.\*

"In glancing back over the chronology of the different nations of which I have treated, you cannot help being struck with the circumstance, that every attempt has failed to establish for any of them, a system of chronology derogatory to the authority of the Mosaic records. In most of them, even when we have granted a real existence to the most doubtful portions of their history, we are not led back to an epoch, anterior to what Scripture assigns for the existence of powerful empires in eastern Africa, and enterprising states on the western coasts of Asia.

"The learned Windischmann, whom I feel a pride in calling my friend, admits the entire period of Chinese history allotted by Klaproth to the uncertain times, and shows its agreement with another form of computation, drawn from the cycles of years adapted by the Chinese; and the result is a sufficiently accurate accordance between the date assigned to the foundation of the Celestial Empire by Fo-li, or Fu-chi, whom some have even supposed to be Noah, the time of the deluge, according to the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the beginning of the Indian Cali-Yuga, or iron age.† The philosophical Schlegel not only concurs in the same view, but approves also of Abel-Rémusat's idea, that the written Chinese character must be 4,000 years old; 'this,' he observes, 'would bring it back within three or four generations from the deluge, according to the vulgar era,—an estimate which certainly is not exaggerated.'‡

"Even in India you have seen authors, like Colonel Tod, assuming almost without limitation, the chronological tables of the country, and yet coming pretty exactly to the same period for the commencement of its history. Surely a convergence like this must have force of proof with the most obstinate mind, and produce conviction that some great and insuperable barrier must have interposed between nations and any earlier definite traditions, at the same time that it allowed some faint rays of recollection to pass, of the original state and happier constitution of the human race. A sudden catastrophe, whereby mankind were, in great part, though not totally extinguished, presents the most natural solution of all difficulties, and the concurrent testimony of physical phenomena, with the silent acknowledgment of the vainest nations, must assuredly shield, from every attack, this record of our inspired volume."—vol. ii. pp. 5-55.

The vast importance of this subject will not permit us to

\* Klaproth. *Ibid.* p. 408.

† "Die Philosophie in Fortgang der Weltgeschichte," part i. p. 18. Bonn. 1827.

‡ "Frederick Schlegel's Philosophy of History, translated from the German, by J. B. Robertson, Esq. with Memoir of the Author," vol. i. p. 106. Saunders and Ottley. London, 1835.

pass it by hurriedly. Confined as our limits are, we can at present do no more than confirm our author's observations by the authority of two Catholic writers of the highest eminence. "The philosophism of the last century," says the celebrated author of the "*Essai sur l'Indifférence en matière de Religion*," "vaunted the prodigious antiquity of the Egyptians, the Chaldeans, the Indians, and the Chinese. At present, even school-boys laugh at that chimerical antiquity, the utter groundlessness of which has been laid open by Goguet, Fréret, Bennetti, and other scholars of the first order. Bailly himself has by very simple calculations, reduced the chronology of the Egyptians, the Chaldeans, the Indians, and the Chinese, to an accordance with the Mosaic chronology. The more we investigate the history of those nations, the more we see their annals, in all they possess of certainty, approximate to the Mosaic chronology. That of the Indians, which Voltaire opposed with so much effrontery to the Bible, does not go farther back than the time of Alexander the Great. Lastly, it would appear that the famous zodiac of Denderah,\* which was transported at great cost from Egypt to France, appeared there only to refute the objections which infidelity deduced from it."†

The next authority which we shall cite, is that of the illustrious Windischmann. In his great work, entitled, "*Philosophy, in her Progress through the World*," and which Dr. Wiseman has referred to in the passage above cited, we meet with the following judicious reflections on Chinese chronology:—

"The Chinese," says he, "reckon by cycles of sixty years, which are founded on the lunar cycle. The first year of the first cycle occurs in the year 2,637 before the birth of Christ, and is the 61st year of the reign of the old Emperor Hoangti. The great and conscientious historian, Su-ma-tsian, who flourished a century before Christ, began his work with that year, and continued it down to the dynasty of Han. Although he was in a situation to make use of all the historical authorities and documents that had come down to him, and really executed his task with such indescribable accuracy and fidelity, that he obtained the office of imperial historiographer, and acquired the name of a father of history; yet the history of China down to the ninth century before the birth of our Lord, remained still incomplete and unconnected. Until the above-mentioned period, the authorities which he consulted, were not, particularly in regard to

---

\* "It is now acknowledged," adds the writer whom we quote, "that of the four famous zodiacs discovered in Egypt, not one is anterior to the Roman domination."

† "*Essai sur l'Indifférence en matière de Religion*," vol. iv. pp. 171-2.

time, perfectly uniform.\* Hence the beginning of *uncertain* history in China must be dated from the first year of the first cycle, 2,637 before the birth of Christ, and the beginning of *authentic or certain* history from the year 782 before the same era."

M. Windischmann, after describing the voluminous extent of the imperial annals of China, and the circumstances under which they are written, and which insure their impartiality, proceeds to observe: "Besides what the historian Su-ma-tsian regarded as irrefragably proved, traditions and sagas have been preserved of ancient emperors, who must have ruled before Hoangti, and to whom the Chinese ascribe all the discoveries most useful to man, such as that of astronomy, of agriculture, of the medical science, of the culture of silk, of writing, &c. Later writers have compiled these ancient traditions, and these compilations bear in some respects the character, partly of the Alexandrian, and partly of the new Pythagorean and new Platonic schools among the Greeks,† that is to say, they are partly critical commentaries, and partly metaphysical and mystical interpretations, or allegorical amplifications of ancient tradition; and in these labours we can trace here as among the Greeks, the foreign influences of India and Thibet, and the formation of a like syncretism of opinions. By these compilations and commentaries, the Chinese history, as well as the Chinese philosophy, is carried beyond 3,000 years before the birth of Christ. But to their more arrogant successors, this remote antiquity did not appear remote enough; and in the first centuries of our era, that is to say, after the introduction of those foreign elements above alluded to, men began, from a misunderstanding of the ancient symbolism and astronomy, to feign a mythological history, divided into ten Ki, or revolutions of time, which taken together must have lasted some 2,286,000, others 3,276,000 years, and which, like the Indian Yugas, find their solution in astronomical calculation. In the eleventh century of our era, these fictions were introduced, and under the dynasty of Song, were formed into a regular system, and prefixed to the Chinese annals under the name of *Wai-ki*;—a denomination which proves that the Chinese well know what value this web possesses as to its form, for the name signifies that which is *extraneous to history*; but the *substance* of ancient tradition, once invested with this form,

---

\* "Among what people," adds M. Windischmann in a note, "are such authorities perfectly uniform? These apparent defects are, however, better than the faultless illusion of a romance."

† "They may also be compared with the Talmud and other Rabbinical commentaries among the Jews."

the Chinese still prize and will not forego. The sequel will prove to us how many undeniable traits of remote antiquity, and of its peculiar views and conceptions, are therein comprised. Thus much in the first place follows from the most accurate investigation of the Chinese chronology and mode of computation, that the Mosaic chronology is thereby as little impaired, as by the Indian, Babylonian or Egyptian chronologies, whatever may be the astronomical import and value of their very ingenious calculations.\*

But it is time to return to our author. The lecture which follows next, turns on the early history and astronomy of Egypt, and is one of the most interesting, as well as best executed in the present volumes. The following very eloquent passage forms a noble introduction to the subject here discussed:—

“From the soil of Asia, over which late we strayed, fruitful in every science, and varied by the display of every degree in cultivation, from the restless nomade or the untamed mountaineer to the luxurious Persian, or the polished Ionian, we have now to turn to a country, whereon Nature seemeth to have set the seal of desolation, physical and moral. One redeeming spot alone of Africa has been the seat of an indigenous civilization, a native dynasty, and a domestic class of monuments; and the valley of the Nile appears rightly placed in such a geographical situation, as almost detaches its inhabitants from the degraded tenants of the wilderness, and links them with the more favoured regions of the East.

“At every period this extraordinary nation has interested the attention of the learned. Its origin seemed to have been a problem to itself, and consequently to all others. The mysterious allegories of its worship, the dark sublimity of its morality, and above all, the impenetrable enigma of its written monuments, threw a mythological veil over its history. The learned approached it, as if in the most obvious facts they had to decypher a hieroglyphic legend; and we were inclined to look upon the Egyptians as a people, which, even in its more modern periods, retained the shadowy tints and ill-defined traits of remote antiquity, and which might consequently boast an existence far beyond the reach of calculation. We were almost tempted to believe them when they told us that their first monarchs were the Gods of the rest of the world.

“When after so many ages of darkness and uncertainty, we see the lost history of this people revive, and take its stand beside that of other ancient empires; when we read the inscriptions of its kings, recording

---

\* “*Die Philosophie im Fortgang der Welt-geschichte*,” 1st part, pp. 9-12: a work, which, for the soundness of its principles, the extent of its erudition, and the depth and majesty of its reflections, yields to few which modern Germany has produced. The first part was published at Bonn in 1827—other parts have since appeared. The author, M. Windischmann, is the Catholic Professor of Philosophy at the University of Bonn. We are happy to see that Dr. Wiseman has, in the work under review, paid a just tribute to the transcendent merits of this great writer and excellent man.—See vol. ii. pp. 262-3.

their mighty exploits and regal qualities, and gaze upon their monuments, with the full understanding of the events which they commemorate, the impression is scarcely less striking to an enlightened mind, than what the traveller would feel, if when silently pacing the catacombs at Thebes, he should see those corpses, which the embalmer's skill has for so many ages rescued from decay, on a sudden burst their cerements, and start resuscitated from their niches.

"While such a darkness overhung the history of Egypt, it is no wonder that the adversaries of religion should have retreated within it, as a strong-hold, and eagerly attacked her from behind its shelter. They collected together the scattered fragments of its annals, just as Isis did the torn limbs of Osiris, and tried to re-construct by their re-union a favourite idol, a chronology of countless ages totally incompatible with that of Moses. Volney had no hesitation in placing the formation of sacerdotal colleges in Egypt 13,300 years before Christ, and calling that the second period of its history.\* Even the third period, in which he supposes the temple of Esneh to have been built, goes as far back as 4,600 years before that era; somewhere about what we reckon the epoch of creation!

"But the mysterious monuments of Egypt formed the most useful entrenchments for these assailants. They called upon those huge and half-buried colossal images, and those now subterranean temples, to bear witness to the antiquity and early civilization of the nation which erected them; they appealed to their astronomical remains to attest the skill, matured by ages of observation, of those who projected them. More than all, they saw in those hieroglyphic legends, the venerable dates of sovereigns, deified long before the modern days of Moses or Abraham; they pointed in triumph to the mysterious characters, which an unseen hand had traced on those primeval walls, and boasted that only a Daniel was wanted that could decipher them, to show that the evidences of Christianity had been weighed, and found wanting; and its kingdom divided between the infidel and the libertine! Vain boast! The temples of Egypt have at length answered their appeal, in language more intelligible than they could possibly have anticipated, for a Daniel has been found, in judicious and persevering study. After the succession had been so long interrupted, Young and Champollion have put on the linen robe of the hierophant; and the monuments of the Nile, unlike the fearful image of Sais, have allowed themselves to be unveiled by their hands, without any but the most wholesome and consoling results having followed from their labour."—vol. ii. pp. 59-62.

Dr. Wiseman gives a most lucid as well as interesting account of the discovery of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and of the important results to which that discovery has led. Of this account we shall now endeavour to lay before our readers a brief analysis, employing, as often as we can, the author's own words.

The Coptic, or modern ecclesiastical language of Egypt, had,

---

\* "*Recherches sur l'Egypte*," vol. ii. p. 440.

from the commencement of the present century, engaged the attention of several distinguished European scholars. Jablonsky, by explaining from this tongue the Egyptian words and names which occur in the Old Testament, had rendered its affinity to the hieroglyphics extremely probable. But all doubt respecting this connexion was removed by the interesting work which the learned Quatremère published at Paris in 1808, entitled "*Recherches sur la Langue et la Littérature de l'Égypte.*" Champollion himself, in a work which appeared in 1814, entitled "*L'Égypte sous les Pharaons,*" derived from Coptic literature much useful information upon the geography and history of ancient Egypt. These we may consider as the first prognostications which prepare as well as betoken every great discovery.

On all Egyptian monuments are to be found "certain groups of hieroglyphics, enclosed in an oblong frame or parallelogram with rounded corners." These it had been conjectured with great probability expressed proper names; for such can in no language be represented by emblems, but must be composed of *phonetic*, or sound-expressing characters. This is the case in the Chinese language.

The French expedition, in digging the foundations of a fort near Rosetta, in Egypt, had discovered an irregular block of basalt, containing three inscriptions, one in Greek, another in hieroglyphics, and a third in an intermediate alphabet, which in the Greek legend is called *enchorial*, and is now known under the name of the *Demotic*. These inscriptions in different languages were evidently the same in tenour; and here, for the first time, was discovered the key for opening to us the mysteries of the old Egyptian literature. The Demotic was the vernacular dialect of Egypt, the Coptic, and has a linear alphabet formed through several gradations from the hieroglyphic. "The illustrious Sylvestre de Sacy had observed, that the letters or symbols used to express the proper names in the *demotic* character, were grouped together, so as to have the appearance of being letters; and by comparing different words, wherein the same sounds occurred, he found them represented by the same figure, and thus he extracted from them the rudiments of a demotic alphabet; which was farther illustrated by Akerblad, at Rome, and Dr. Young, in England." A copy of a demotic manuscript which Champollion presented to Dr. Young, and a Greek translation of the same manuscript, which chance threw in his way, facilitated the researches of the English scholar, who must be considered as the restorer of this part of Egyptian literature. An acquaintance with the demotic alphabet naturally prepared the way for a knowledge of hieroglyphics. By conjecturing that



the frames in the inscription of Rosetta included the name of Ptolemy, and that another, in which was inscribed a group with what he considered justly the sign of a feminine, contained that of Berenice, Dr. Young made the first step in the discovery of hieroglyphics. But as he considered each hieroglyphic to be syllabic, and to represent a consonant with its vowel, his system, as was afterwards proved, would have fallen to the ground.

The next advance in the science was made by Champollion.

In the island of Philæ, situated high up the Nile, an obelisk was found with two frames, containing hieroglyphics, joined together. One of these frames presented the group already explained by the name of Ptolemy. The other evidently contained a name composed in part of the same letters, and followed by the sign of the feminine gender. This obelisk had been originally placed on a base bearing a Greek inscription, which contained a petition of the priests of Isis to *Ptolemy and Cleopatra*, and spoke of a monument to be raised to both. There was consequently every reason to suppose that the obelisk bore these two names conjointly; and observation proved that the three letters common to both, P, T, and L, were represented in the female name by the same signs as occurred for them in the king's. Thus, there could be no reasonable doubt as to the second name, which put the learned investigators in possession of the other letters which enter into its composition. It is just to observe that the priority of claim to this discovery is a subject of dispute between M. Champollion and our countryman Mr. Banks.

"Many scattered passages," says our author, "exist in ancient writers regarding the hieroglyphical writings of the Egyptians, but there was one which seemed to treat the subject with peculiar detail. It lay treasured up in that vast repertory of philosophical learning, the *Stromata* of Clement of Alexandria; but so encased in impenetrable difficulties, that it may rather be said to have been explained by these modern discoveries than to have led the way towards them. It has, however, rendered them most essential service, by strongly corroborating what must be considered the essential foundation of their results, the position, that alphabetical letters were used by the Egyptians. When this passage was examined after Champollion's discovery, it was found to establish this point, which had not been suspected by older investigators, and, moreover, to explain the various mixture of alphabetical and symbolical writing used in Egypt, in a manner exactly corresponding to what monuments exhibit. The result of this passage, as translated and commented on by Letronne, is, that the Egyptians used three different sorts of writing; the *epistolographic*, or current hand; the *hieratic*, or the character used by the priests; and the *hieroglyphic*, or monumental character. Of the two former, we have sufficient examples: the first being the *demotic* or

*enchorial*, of which I have already spoken; the second, a species of reduced hieroglyphical character, in which a rude outline represents the figures, and which is found on manuscripts which accompany mummies. The third, which is the most important, is composed, according to Clement, first, of alphabetical words; and, secondly, of symbolical expressions, which, again, are threefold, being either representations of objects, or metaphorical ideas drawn from them, as when courage is represented by a lion; or else merely enigmatical or arbitrary signs. Now, observation has fully confirmed all these particulars; for even on the Rosetta stone, it was noticed, that when some object was mentioned in the Greek, the hieroglyphics presented a picture of it, as a statue, a temple, or a man. On other occasions objects are represented by emblems which must be considered completely arbitrary, as Osiris by a throne and eye, and a son by a bird most resembling a goose. Suffice it to say, that new discoveries have gradually enlarged, and perhaps almost completed the Egyptian alphabet, till we are in possession of a key to read all proper names, and even, though not with equal certainty, other hieroglyphical texts. To proper names, the application is so simple, that you may be said to possess a means of verifying the system perfectly within reach; for you have only to walk to the Capitol or the Vatican, with Champollion's alphabet, and try your skill upon the proper names in any of the Egyptian inscriptions."—vol. ii. p. 73-5.

The author, after noticing the groundless cavils taken against these important discoveries, proceeds to specify some of the admirable illustrations and confirmations of Scripture history which they furnish. The Lecture closes with an interesting account of the controversy respecting the astronomical monuments of ancient Egypt. Here, as in every other case, it is shown how perseverant research has succeeded in overthrowing the objections of infidelity against the truth of the sacred writings.

The lecture on Archæology, though, from the subject being necessarily more rambling and discursive, is very interesting. The passages on the monuments connected with the deluge, and on the memorials of the numbers and of the sufferings of the early Christian martyrs, must be perused with pleasure by Christians of all denominations. On the latter subject, the reader will find the insidious attempts of the Protestant Dodwell and the infidel Gibbon, to diminish the number and tarnish the glory of those illustrious victims of Pagan injustice and cruelty, disproved by the evidence of monumental inscriptions themselves.

"Doubtless," observes Dr. Wiseman, "Ansaldi and others have well performed the task of confuting these assertions upon historical grounds; but monumental inscriptions afford the most direct and satisfactory means of overthrowing them. Visconti has taken the pains to collect, from the

voluminous works on Christian antiquity, such inscriptions as show the number of those who shed their blood for Christ.\*—p. 139.

The lecture on Archæology terminates with the following beautiful passage, where the elevation of thought and the dignity of style are tempered by the amenity of feeling which pervades it. What heart can resist the appeal to concord and brotherly love made by the amiable author!

"Let these examples suffice; for when I remember where we are,—in the very heart and citadel of this science (Archæology), where its great influences are drunk in by every sense, and we ourselves become, as it were, identified with the recollections of its sacred monuments, I feel as if the detailing of a few insignificant instances of its power to aid our faith must appear almost a needless importunity. There has been one † who sat upon the ruins of this city, and was led by the train of reflections they suggested to plan that work upon its later history to which I have this day referred,

‘Sapping a solemn creed with solemn sneer.’

But surely a believing mind must rise from such a meditation with very different feelings; oppressed, indeed, with the whole weight of his natural feebleness, humbled in spirit before the colossal wrecks of matchless grandeur, more than ever sunk into littleness before the memorials of almost superhuman power; but, at the same time, cheered by other and more consoling thoughts. For even those heathen monuments have many holy recollections: of the three triumphal arches, one records the fulfilment of a great prophecy, the other the triumph of Christianity over heathenism; and the Flavian amphitheatre was once the scene of the martyrs' witnessing. And surely, whatever creed any may profess, he cannot visit but with soothed and solemn feeling those many old and venerable churches which stand alone amidst the ruins of ancient buildings; not because they were erected in solitude, but because, like the insulated cones that rise on the flanks of mountains, the inundations of many ages have washed down around them the less durable materials that enclosed and connected them together. And if he enter some of these, and see them yet retaining all their parts and decorations, even as they were in early times, so unmoved, so unchanged, as if the very atmosphere breathed in them by the ancient Christians had not been disturbed, methinks it were not difficult for him to feel for some short space as they did, to wish that all else had suffered as small mutation, and long that religion could once more strike its roots as deeply into our hearts as their's, and, if it produce no more the martyr's palm, put forth at least the olive branch of peace. And wherever we move among the remains of the ancient city, whether in search of amusement or instruction, there is caught a tone of mind, which the most thoughtless cannot escape, an essentially subduing of all selfish and particular feelings; an approximation to a religious frame of soul, which shows how necessarily

---

\* See the "*Memorie Romane di Antichità*," tom. i. Rome, 1825.

† Gibbon.

the destruction of all mere earthly power was a preliminary step to the introduction of a more spiritual influence, even as the contemplation of that destruction opens the way to that influence's personal action. And thus may we say that archaeology, the study of ruins and of monuments, while it enlightens and delights us, may well form the basis of the strongest religious impressions and individual evidences."—p. 157-9.

In the following lecture Dr. Wiseman enters on a field in which he has already acquired so much distinction,—we mean the department of Biblical Criticism. After some preliminary observations, no less philosophical than eloquent, on the East, considered as the cradle of nations, he proceeds to point out the importance of this study in relation to polemical theology. He then traces the history of sacred criticism, and shows how its elements existed in the earliest ages of the Church, and how, in despite of the calumnies of some modern writers, ecclesiastical authority has ever encouraged and promoted Biblical studies and researches. The critical labours of Dr. Kennicott and of the Canon de Rossi, on the text of the Old Testament, and those of Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach, on the text of the New, successively pass under review, and receive a most enlightened appreciation. In this department of literature, the same results attended the progress of investigation as had marked the course of every other. The difficulties and doubts, which, like lowering clouds, had overhung the early march of this science, were gradually dispelled in the course of its progress; the vain hopes of heresy and infidelity were successively defeated; and every new critical research has tended to vindicate more and more the purity and integrity of the sacred text.

"Griesbach," says our author, "found by a long and diligent research, that all known manuscripts are divided into three classes, to which he has given the name of *Recensions*, because he supposes them to have been produced by corrected editions of the text in different countries; and he consequently gives them the titles of the Alexandrian, the Western, and the Byzantine Recensions. Every known manuscript belongs to one of these classes; and though it may occasionally depart from its type, it accords with it on the whole. The consequence of this arrangement is obvious. We no longer speak of twenty manuscripts being in favour of one reading, and as many on the other side, nor think of examining their individual value; nor have we to weigh numbers against intrinsic worth, and decide between them. Individual manuscripts have now no value, but we only decide between families. If two families agree, their joint reading is probably correct; if they are so blended together that MSS. of all families are confusedly mixed on both sides, the question cannot be decided. But here we have a security against the discovery of any future documents. For if any manuscript, however venerable and precious, were to be discovered, it must enter

into the ranks, and submit to be classified with one of the families, whose weight it might increase, while it lost all individual authority; and thus it could no ways disturb our security. And if it presented such anomalies as would exclude it from them all, and prevent its classification, it must be considered a vagrant and outlaw, and could no more derange the system than a comet cutting through the orbits of the planets could be said to disturb their order by refusing to come into their arrangement.

“This great and important step in the critical study of the New Testament has received important modifications, all tending to simplify it farther. Nolan, Hug, Scholz, and many others, have proposed various arrangements and distributions of manuscripts; but they have gone little farther than varying the names and numbers of the classes; the principles they have preserved entire.”—pp. 184-5.

From the history of the critical study of the sacred text, our author proceeds to give a rapid but interesting account of the rise and progress of Biblical philology in modern Europe. The different schools which successively prevailed in the study of Hebrew grammar—the Rabbinical, the exclusive Christian, the Dutch, and the German; the aid which the Hebrew student may derive from the cognate dialects, the Chaldaic, the Syriac, the Arabic, and the Ethiopic; and the very important elucidations which Hebrew grammar and lexicography furnish to hermeneutical science, are set forth with equal perspicuity and elegance.

In treating of Hermeneutics, Dr. Wiseman shows how the principles of this science have been known and applied in the earliest ages of the Church; and that if it did not then attain to that high degree of systematic arrangement and precision which it has since acquired, it only shared the fate of other sciences where experience and observation must necessarily precede the construction of theory. He shows, also, how the progress of this study has conduced to the vindication of the ancient fathers of the Church, considered as scholiasts and interpreters of Scripture; and that some of the most eminent theologians of Protestant Germany begin to make an atonement to these learned and venerable men for the insults and calumnies heaped on them by the Rationalists of the last generation.

It is pleasing to see the authority of the fathers thus vindicated by the enemies of their creed. The following passage will show that recent science has also done justice to some Catholic expositors of a more modern date, whose writings had been latterly too much neglected even by Catholics themselves:—

“Having thus shown that however modern this science may be in its code, it is as ancient as Christianity in its principles, we must pass over the lapse of a thousand years of its history, and approach nearer our own

times. Upon the revival of letters, numerous commentators arose among our divines, whose works have shared the obloquy heaped upon those of the fifth century. It has been esteemed a duty to decry the voluminous productions of these diligent, and often sagacious expositors, as a mere mass of literary rubbish, fit, perhaps, to fill the shelves of a library, but not to encumber the table of the study.

"But though they are often too prolix, and tend too much to allegorical interpretation, it would be injustice to deny, that in the diligent collection and discussion of others' opinions, in a sagacious examination of the context and bearing of a passage, and in the happy removal of serious difficulties, they have cleared the way for their successors, and effected much more than these are always careful to acknowledge. The Commentary, for instance, of Pradus and Villalpandus on Ezechiel, which was published at Rome from 1596 to 1604, is still the great repertory to which every modern scholiast must recur in explaining the difficulties of that book; and is acknowledged by the most learned of them to be a work replete with varied erudition, and most useful to the study of antiquity.\*

"The annotations of Agelli upon the Psalms, published also at Rome, in 1606, have been pronounced by the same writer, after Ernesti, the work of 'a most learned and most sagacious author, who is peculiarly happy in explaining the relations of the Alexandrian and the vulgate versions.'† Even greater commendations are lavished by the learned and ingenious Schultens, upon the Spanish Jesuit Pineda, whose notes upon Job (Madrid, 1597) he acknowledges 'to have eased him of no small part of his labours.' He styles their author, 'Theologus et Literator eximius magnus, apud suos, apud nos quoque.'‡ Maldonatus on the Gospels has been praised and recommended by Ernesti, though, as might be expected, the recommendation is recalled in harsh terms by his annotator Ammon.§

"When, some years ago, it was proposed in Germany to republish Calmet's commentaries, the very mention of such a scheme excited the ridicule of the liberal school; yet I have been assured by a very sound scholar that he had compared his notes on Isaiah with Lowth's, and had generally found the most beautiful illustrations of the English bishop anticipated by the learned Benedictine. Another learned friend has pointed out to me considerable transcriptions from him in modern annotators without the slightest acknowledgment.|| But no one has put the truth of these observations in a stronger light than my late amiable and excellent friend, Professor Ackermann, in his Commentary on the Minor Prophets.¶ Throughout the whole of this work, the opinions of the

\* Rosenmüller, Ezechielis, Vaticinia, vol. i. p. 32. Lips. 1826.

† "Psalmi," vol. i. Lips. 1821. (Præf. p. 5.)

‡ Liber Jobi cum novâ Versione. Lug. Bat. 1737.

§ Instit. p. 353.

|| For instance, Rosenmüller's *Prophetæ Minores*, vol. ii. p. 337, seq. is taken almost verbatim from Calmet's preface on Jonas, "*Commentaire Literal*," vol. vi. p. 893, fol. Par. 1726.

¶ *Prophetæ Minores, perpetuâ Annotatione illustrati*, à Doctore P. F. Ackermann. Vienna, 1830.

old Catholic divines have been collected and honourably mentioned. It is pleasing to see these writers, whose names it has become so unfashionable to quote, once more treated with respect; and there is something almost amusing in the frequent juxta-position of Rosenmüller and Cornelius à Lapide, Oedmann and Figueiro, Horst and De Castro."—pp. 212-215.

Dr. Wiseman then proceeds to give a rapid history of German rationalism, especially in its relation to the prophetic writings of the Old Testament. The licentious extravagance and reckless impiety of this school are strongly described; but it has pleased Divine Providence to set a term to its career of wickedness. As the very excess of error is sure to conduce to the triumph of truth, so it cannot be doubted that it was the aberrations of rationalism which, more than any thing else, promoted in Germany that mighty reaction towards Catholicism, which is certainly one of the most striking, as it is one of the most consoling, events of our times. The greatest intellects of that country are now clearly on the side of the true church; but among her opponents are to be found, not only the greatest number of writers, but also some men of very superior genius. Rationalism is too negative a system—one too much occupied with petty details—too inconsistent with the whole economy of the moral world, to satisfy the earnest religious yearnings of the human heart, or answer the deeper enquiries of the human mind. Accordingly the men of high soul and vigorous understanding among the German Protestants, have of late years taken refuge in pictism—a system of vague religious feeling, without definite doctrines, or distinct forms of worship and ecclesiastical government.● In the general shipwreck of Protestant doctrines, this has appeared to many the last plank of safety; nor can we be surprised at such an idea, when we reflect that religious feeling is more indestructible than religious opinion. Other thinkers again, disgusted with the endless variations, and perplexed by the manifest contradictions of Protestantism, and yet too proud or too prejudiced to cast a retrospective glance on the ancient church, have leaped blindfold into the gulf of pantheism. Yet rationalism has struck too deep roots in the Germanic soil—it is too closely interwoven into the whole texture of the German Protestant churches—too native to the very genius of Protestantism itself, to be easily eradicated. Accordingly, it still numbers among its defenders the majority of Protestant divines in the country we speak of; and although, as has been observed, the pietists, and even the pantheists, possess much profounder intellects, the rationalists can still boast of many men of great learning and critical acuteness.

The eleventh lecture, though rather too desultory, abounds with interesting matter. Its object is to point out the services

which Oriental literature has rendered to religion. And for this end, the author shows by a few appropriate examples, what pleasing illustrations and powerful confirmations, the sacred writings have received from Oriental archæology, Oriental history, and Oriental philosophy. The length to which this article has already swelled, forbids us to cite any of these examples, interesting as they would be to our readers. We should recommend the author, in a subsequent edition, to unite this lecture with the seventh. As we are in the way of suggestions, we think it would have been more philosophical, had he commenced his work with a definition of Faith and of Science, and with an indication of the relations, in which they should stand one to the other. We beg leave to observe, also, that the philological disquisition from page 221 to page 227, vol. ii., important as it may be, would appear better in a note than in the text. These are the few improvements, which, it appears to us on a careful perusal, may be made in this excellent work.

In his last lecture, Dr. Wiseman gives a rapid summary of the results of his labours, and the conclusions to which they lead. He shows in the first place that the Bible has come triumphantly out of the most terrible ordeal to which any writings, or systems of philosophy, have ever been subjected—that it has stood the proof of tests, so numerous, so various, and so searching, as would infallibly have led to the exposure of a system of error or imposture, however specious and plausible it might be. The number of writers who have been engaged in the composition of those sacred books, which we call emphatically the *Bible*—the distance of time which separates many of them from each other—the diversity of circumstances under which they wrote—the diversity of their minds, characters, habits, and condition—lastly, the diversity of influences which directed their compositions (an hypothesis which we must admit, if we once deny their divine inspiration)—all prove that the unity of doctrine and testimony, which prevails among them, could not be the result of any previous concert or artificial combination. Allowing even the monstrous hypothesis of such an unnatural combination, no skill, no ingenuity, no sagacity, however provident, as our author well observes, could have secured a system of error or deceit against the unknown and unforeseen discoveries of the future.

“Had the name of a single Egyptian Pharaoh been invented to suit convenience, as we see done by other Oriental historians, the discovery of the hieroglyphic alphabet, after 3,000 years, would not have been one of the chances of detection against which the historian would have guarded. Had the history of the Creation, or of the Deluge, been a fabulous or poetical fiction, the toilsome journeys of the geologist among



Alpine valleys, or the discovery of hyænas' caves in an unknown island, would not be the confirmations of his theory, or which its inventor would have ever reckoned. A fragment of Berosus comes to light, and it proves what seemed before incredible, to be perfectly true. A medal is found, and it completes the reconciliation of apparent contradictions. Every science, every pursuit, as it makes a step in its own natural, onward progress, encreases the mass of our confirmatory evidence."—vol. ii. pp. 289-90.

Secondly, it is shown that the points on which the veracity of the Bible is confirmed or illustrated by the evidence of profane science, are mostly incidental; sometimes of little importance, and frequently unconnected with the main object or general narrative of the sacred penmen. Yet it is precisely these incidental or subordinate topics, which most easily elude the artifices of fraud, and which criticism regards as the best touch-stones to discern the truth or falsity of historical documents. The great biblical scholar, Hug, remarks, that it was some gross and palpable error in geography, which convinced the learned world, that the materials for the biography of Apollonius of Tyana were not drawn, as its author, Philostratus, professes, from the documents of eye-witnesses and companions of the hero, but from later narratives or the inventions of fancy.

Lastly, the author demonstrates that the illustrations and proofs which profane science furnishes in favour of religion, have been adduced not only by her apologists and defenders, but also by two opposite classes of writers; the one consisting of men directly hostile to Christianity, the other of such as were utterly ignorant of the bearings which their scientific enquiries had, or could possibly have, upon the evidence of revealed religion.

This noble work concludes with a no less urgent than appropriate exhortation to the prosecution of learning, and the sanctification of learning, by religious aims and motives. Although these lectures had already amply demonstrated the utility of profane science to the objects of man's highest concern, yet the learned author deems it expedient to confute the opinion of those ill-judging Christians, who existing, as it would appear, in all ages of the church, imagine that the pursuit of human learning is to be discouraged, as calculated to lead the mind off from the contemplation of heavenly things. He supports his views by the authority of the most eminent among the ancient fathers of the church. St. Clemens of Alexandria, Origen, St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Gregory of Nazianzen, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, come forth successively, like venerable elders, their example corroborating their opinion, to deliver their testimony in favour of the usefulness, nay, the necessity, of profane learn-

ing. Their important testimonies, our limits, we regret to say, will not permit us to cite; yet their opinions on this matter are all embodied in the pithy and pungent sentence cited by the author from St. Gregory Nazianzen:—"Therefore must not erudition be reproved, because some men chuse to think so; on the contrary, they are to be considered foolish and ignorant, who so reason, who would wish all men to be like themselves, that they may be concealed in the crowd, and no one be able to detect their want of education."\*

Our excellent clergy will, we are sure, eagerly respond to the noble appeal which Dr. Wiseman has made to them. They will be proud to follow the precepts, and emulate the example, of this distinguished ecclesiastic. They will not disappoint the expectations of their country, and they will show themselves equal to the present great crisis of the moral world. Priests of the Irish and British Catholic churches! for you the age of confessors and martyrs has passed away—that of doctors has commenced. To you chiefly has been assigned one of the noblest missions, which Providence ever allotted to men. The moral and intellectual regeneration of a decaying empire: such is the mighty task which the all-wise Disposer of events has evidently reserved for you. But for the accomplishment of so momentous a task, great exertions, long labours, and preparatory discipline, are requisite. Should you be insensible to this gracious call—should you let this glorious opportunity pass unheeded by, awful indeed will be your reckoning to God and to posterity!

In conclusion, we can only say, that if a work of this transcendent merit, calculated as it is for so extensive a circle of readers, and carefully excluding all topics of religious controversy between Catholics and Protestants, should fail to meet with that encouragement it so well deserves, we shall only have to sigh over the hopeless degradation of the national taste.

---

#### ART. III.—*Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.*

"WE are in a state of transition"—"Intellect is progressing, the schoolmaster is abroad." These sayings, true as they undoubtedly are, and well employed as they were at first, have now, by their frequent repetition, wearied our ears. Reformers and Conservatives alike have quoted them; the one in

---

\* St. Gregor. Nazianzeni "Funebris oratio in laudem Basilii Magni, Opera." Par. 1609, t. p. 323.

sincerity, the other in mockery ; until at length, by a tacit sort of mutual consent, they are beginning to fall into disuse and neglect. Their truth, however, is not the less indisputable. Men's minds are awakening from the nightmare slumbers of bigotry and prejudice—old opinions are losing their inveteracy, enlightenment is spreading through every rank and through every country ; important changes have occurred, and many still more important are casting deep shadows before. The fetters of industry are falling from around her, ports are opening, monopolies are breaking up, governments are abandoning the hot-bed system of protections, nations are beginning to consider each other, no longer as natural enemies, but as members of the common family of mankind. Every where the spirit of wholesome change is spreading its influence, bringing health and life and happiness, where, before, there was but the foul stagnation of bigotry and hopeless ignorance..

Some of its achievements have been rapid, yet, at least in these countries, none have been too much so. We have rather erred on the other side ; we have at times been too deliberate—too circumspect. Crying evils and gross injustices in several forms have been given too long a day—the English public, constitutionally cold and cautious, require a considerable time before the steam can be properly got up and the machine fairly set in motion. This once accomplished, indeed, none do their business better, but in their case, the first step is truly the difficult one. It was a long and weary effort to work out the great measure of Reform ; a measure that they knew to bear immediately upon their best interests. There was apathy—there was readiness to believe the misrepresentations of the bitterest enemies of improvement—there were a myriad of local obstacles, all to be removed, or trampled upon, before the spirit of the nation could be roused to the combat. And the difficulty of effecting this was well proved by the alacrity with which the popular mind sunk again into repose, when the measure that required its efforts was at length achieved.

Still changes and great changes have been accomplished, and there are others at no very great distance. Two, however, and two of much difficulty are yet to be effected. In the English mind there remain, sunk fathoms deep, two prejudices, the one anti-Irish—the other anti-Catholic. The first has for its groundwork no better reason than the old line supplies :—

“ They never pardon, who have done the wrong.”

It is in vain that professions are made of love for Ireland—of admiration of her soil, her climate, her people—a thousand little

unguarded occasions bring out the latent feelings of dislike unconsciously to their possessor. The very persons who are loudest in denouncing the misrule and oppressions of seven centuries of English domination in Ireland, these very men feel this prejudice deep rooted in their hearts. It is true, that matters are not so bad now, in this respect, as they were some years ago; but every Irishman who has been any time in England, knows that they are yet sufficiently bad. We could pursue this subject and tell over in detail instances, without number, derived from personal observation, and quote names in the front ranks of those who advocate a better policy towards Ireland—but the theme is an invidious one, and we gladly turn away from its consideration.

The other prejudice is *anti-Catholic*. This is very widely spread. It prevails in other nations, as well as at home. Russia, Prussia, Germany,—even free America, acknowledge its power and influence. It is, however, with its workings at home that we have more immediately to do. Here it meets us at every step—from the loud “No-Popery” howl in Exeter Hall, or at the English elections, to the disguised, or open sneers in periodicals and novels. The savage nature of the penal laws is now almost universally confessed and reprobated. Indeed, save among the fanatic members of some of the ultra Orange lodges, not a voice is now raised to applaud them, or defend their enactment. But the spirit from which they emanated, is as alive and lifelike as ever. It is true that the altered condition of society renders outward declarations less frequent than they were; yet even where there is the greatest caution and the greatest consideration, the old leaven will break out at times. But this caution and this consideration are too often disregarded, not by the professed haters of “Popery” alone, but by many of those who are the loudest advocates of civil and religious freedom. There are reasons, indeed, although bad ones, why a Winchelsea, an Inglis, a Jackson in parliament; a Blackwood, a Fraser in literature; a M’Crea, or an O’Mulligan in meetings of the elect and thorough-godly, should vent their bile against the Catholics and their religion. Such effusions we can understand and account for, but we can neither understand, nor admire the feelings that impel those who are professed and known advocates of universal liberty of conscience, to vilify a religion, for which and for whose professors they at the same moment claim an equality of political position and rights. Such men are illiberal in order to prove their liberality. They condemn and even slander a religion of which they know nothing save the nursery tales, which ancient bigotry instilled into their minds in childhood. In the

same breath they call aloud for its entire toleration throughout the world. They seem as if ever haunted with a fear of being inclined towards what they call its "errors." Theirs is the scrupulous impartiality which "o'earleaps itself and falls on t'other side." They balance and sometimes *over* balance their good deeds with foul words. Many of them cannot express the most common sentiment in favour of religious freedom, without bowing down before the still rampant figure of bigotry, and paying the tribute of some denunciations against "Papistry." This, perhaps, is on the principle, that the Catholics should not escape the common fate of mortals,—that there should be some alloy in the measure of good dealt out to them, lest they should be too much gratified, too uninterruptedly blissful. It certainly is useful in some degree, as it lightens considerably the load of gratitude under which we should labour were the concessions to us, and efforts in our favour made without such accompaniment. Even a dog will not often fawn upon the man who beats while he feeds him.

One notable specimen of this "illiberal liberality" will serve as well as a hundred. It is only one of many that we could cite, yet the peculiar circumstances attending it, render it perhaps more striking and better calculated to illustrate our argument than a host of others. In the end of 1834, the efforts of a liberal ministry to lighten the burthen of the Established Church upon the people of Ireland, led to powerful combinations against themselves, and at length to their dismissal from office. Those who would perpetuate the crying injustice of a Protestant Church levying contributions from an impoverished Catholic peasantry, seized on the reins of power, and essayed to govern. The realm was shaken to its centre, the dogs of bigotry and persecution were let slip, the fiendish shout of "No-Popery" was raised, and the most desperate and unscrupulous efforts were made to support those who were pledged against the measure of mercy and justice. The result is well known,—those efforts utterly failed. The ex-ministers, strong in the righteousness of their cause, went to the fight fearlessly and came off victorious. The Tory party were foiled and defeated on the very question upon which they had made their appeal to the country. This was a great achievement. Those who headed the liberal host in the struggle, were indeed borne on by the strength of popular feeling, yet they had acted well their own part in the conflict, and they merited praise and gratitude. Yet, in the moment when these sentiments were likely to be strongest, how does one at least of them, qualify his own merits:—

"For his own part (see Lord Howick's speech. *Hansard*, 3rd series,

vol. xxii. p. 445) he was most sincerely and conscientiously a Protestant—not only did he dissent from the Catholic Church, but he owned he was not able, with all the powers of his mind, to comprehend how those who acknowledged the authority of the Scriptures, could assent to the Roman Catholic creed. It appeared to him a lamentable corruption of the purity of the Christian faith! (Cheers and laughter.)”

The Tories cheered and laughed, as well they might. Such language was music to the ears of men whose hopes of power and place had split upon the rock of their hatred of Catholics and Catholicity. They thought, too, they foresaw in this the glimmerings of a spark of discord, which, if properly fanned, might yet blaze up in the liberal ranks, and, by disuniting, render them an easy conquest. That their fond predictions have not been realized, can be attributed only to the patience under injury of those whose faith was thus held up to scorn by a professing friend. We could, as we have said, accompany this flagrant instance with many others, coming from Liberals, but we should fill the entire Review were we to quote them all. As to attacks from open enemies, the outpourings of the last parliamentary recess alone, would fill many volumes. That recess was abundantly prolific in abuse. During the dinner-influenza which raged so universally among the Tories, throughout the period we speak of, the English language, the writings of the ancients, the crazy imaginations of moderns, all were ransacked for images and words to depict the fell spirit of “Popery.” The last description that met our eye was decidedly the best—it was from the mouth of a reverend gentleman of some part of England, who figured “Popery” as a fiend breathing pestilence—with serpents for her hair—a hateful leprosy overspreading her limbs—her horrid eyes darting flames and desolation—and the hon. member for Kilkenny stalking behind her, as esquire of the body to this amiable personage!

But the spirit of the age is, although very slowly, yet still certainly, bringing some amendment, so far as the words and actions of all but the rabid portion of the Conservatives, are concerned. That portion, composed as it is of fanatics, adventurers and dupes, will still wield their “*brutum fulmen*” in despite of reason and of charity, and the Catholics can well afford them the indulgence of pity and contempt. Putting them therefore out of the question, there is some *outward* amendments at least, with regard to the matters of which we complain. The day of actual proscription is long gone by—Catholics, the old restrictions being taken off, are fast assuming the stations that their birth and acquirements entitle them to. In society there

are no longer exclusively Protestant ears to listen to remarks upon the long proscribed faith. The subject is now one likely to cause jars—the old unanimity is gone. Men liberal in other matters are gradually finding the necessity of being liberal in this, or at the least confining themselves to that mode of expressing disapproval, that “just hints a fault and hesitates dislike.” Men—even friends—spoke much more openly not very many years ago. What now is “mistaken belief,” was then “idolatry”—what now is “antiquated,” was then “absurd.” Day after day increasing intelligence and increasing good feeling are enforcing the doctrines of practical charity, and where men cannot agree or approve, they are learning to be at least silent. The Catholics are, and ever have been ready to forgive and to forget. With the echo of the abusive speech they allow to die away the angry feelings it may have raised, and are prompt to believe in repentance when the offence is not repeated. But there are men whom it is difficult to forgive—men who pervert literature to the vile purposes of party and sectarianism, and whose attacks are of more permanence from the nature of the vehicle they have chosen to convey them. The slanders and calumnies of a Hume, a Smollett, &c., &c., in the last century—the attacks of a Lardner and others in the present, would provoke anger did they not revenge themselves by reflecting lasting discredit and deep shame on those authors, who, with well-informed and enlightened minds, after spending years in deep study and calm philosophical research, deliberately lowered themselves by propagating the foulest and falsest assertions against the religion of a large portion of their fellow-countrymen. But it is not in the higher walks of literature that the greatest capability of doing mischief exists; there is a lower species of literary productions that is far more extensively read, and exercises much more influence over the general mind than grave histories, lengthy encyclopædias, and philosophical dissertations. We allude to those that come under the description of “belles lettres.” These are in every hand, we meet them at every step, and almost each new month adds to the multitude already in existence. It might have been expected that at least these works would be untainted by the introduction of peculiar topics of offence—this, however, is very far from being the case. Many of the writers have lent themselves, some with deliberate intention—some through the mere impulse of early and almost innate bigotry to the task of pandering to the depraved appetites of those who revel in the slander of the Catholic religion. We would not be understood to speak of the host of romance writers,

whose names and works are now forgotten, save when seen in the catalogue of a circulating library, and in whose pages dark inquisitors, convent-dungeons, cowed monks, prompt to use the secret dagger, or drug the cup with death, and a thousand horrors more, all the offspring and consequences of the "*Romish*" religion, were crowded, harrowing up the souls and freezing the young blood of the inmates of boarding-schools and milliners' workrooms. They wrote with the spirit of their time. The wild scenes of their crazed fancies were tinted with the dark hues of a bigotry fostered and fomented by the rulers of the land, and imbibed with the mother's milk. Nor could they do much harm. Beyond the limits above-mentioned they were little read, and they are now as buried in oblivion as the deeds of the great men that lived before Agamemnon. But we do speak of authors, whose works have spread far and wide, who count among their readers the old and the young, and persons in every variety of circumstance. To one or other of the motives we have before assigned (it skills not which, as both are almost equally unworthy) all the attacks in the pages of such authors, must be attributed. We will not stop to enquire to which it was owing, or if to a mixture of both, that Lord Byron, the boasted liberal, the strenuous advocate in parliament of the Catholics, forgets himself so far as in one of his works to denounce their religion as "an execrable superstition." The expression will be found in the notes to the third canto of "*Childe Harold*." The poet in his enthusiasm about the wild, and to use the most charitable epithet, insane Rousseau, finds much fault with the monks of St. Bernard, for converting the "*Bosquet de Julie*" into a vineyard. One would have imagined that a fraternity, whom almost every writer has concurred to praise, who have set through ages so splendid an example of self-sacrifice and beneficence to mankind, deserved better treatment than to be styled the "miserable drones of an execrable superstition." Yet this is the language of a friend to Catholics, because a few trees, among which an atheistical dreamer had chosen to lay the scene of one of his crazed romances, were cut down to make room for useful cultivation. This is the language not of a low-born, untaught, unenlightened bigot, but of a nobleman, one who had all the advantages of travel, education, and knowledge of the world. The influence and *prestige* that attend such a man, render his sentiments of far more weight, even when only once expressed, than the life-long ravings of bigots of low degree. But serious as his fault is, it is far outpassed by the slanders of one, whose reputation is as far spread, whose works are much more numerous, and whose influence on the public mind was and is far



greater. We grieve to mention the name of Sir Walter Scott. Of no man could it be more truly said, that

“Born for the universe, he narrowed his mind,  
And to party gave up, what was meant for mankind.”

When he made his eagle spring from obscurity to the full blaze of the public eye, what a glorious field was before him ! His refined and cultivated mind must have been disabused of the gross errors and prejudices that spread their foul vapours over less developed intellects. He had caught general attention. The maudlin and extravagant romance—the prosing novel of the old school, that dragged its slow length along through eight or nine volumes, requiring a list of dramatis personæ like a play bill, to keep names and characters in memory—both these sunk at once before the beauty, the sustained interest, the deep and concentrated power of his admirable works. The public looked eagerly to him for amusement and instruction. Then might the “Great Unknown” have bent his powerful mind to a worthy task—that of weeding out the rank roots of bigotry and prejudice. Then might he have won a glorious name by directing the popular energies and sympathies to the despised and insulted professors of the ancient faith, and lent his aid to remove the foul blot of intolerance from the character of the nation. He chose another course. He lowered himself to confirm old bigotry and old prejudice. He pandered to the unmerited and unsparing hatred and contempt showered down upon the Catholic religion, and those who hold by its tenets. He devoted one entire novel, “*The Monastery*,” and part of “*The Abbot*,” to the vile purpose of describing Catholic clergymen, and doctrines, not as they were, or are, but as they have been slanderously and calumniously represented. He puts in the mouths of his Catholic characters the most atrocious sentiments and maxims, even the thread-bare calumny that “the end justifies the means,” and, from his own false representation, deduces arguments against the slandered religion. The same bad and shameful animus pervades a great proportion of his other writings, whether in poetry or prose. And his example has led on a myriad of writers of less note to follow the same unworthy course: but it would be trespassing upon the time and patience of the reader, to record even the names of those who, at an humble distance, copy his faults and his vices, while they vainly endeavour to imitate those qualities that have rendered him illustrious.

We have said that this “no-popery” under current is slackening—in time we may hope that it will disappear. Even among those who are at present the advocates of religious exclusion and

oppression, the enlightened portion of them must see the inutility, for any *good* purpose, of attacks upon the religion of those who differ from them. Such attacks can effect nothing but to add to the inveteracy of the antagonist opinions, and to keep up a continual source of social bitterness. These things being so, it surely is time for liberal men to be liberal on the subject of religion, as upon all others. To them it can be of no use to endeavour to perpetuate bad feeling and prejudice. The liberal cause is based upon a better and a holier support,—the great principle inculcated by the Divine precept—that of universal benevolence. To profess to have this in view, and yet to foster and encourage a practice that is likely to awaken the bitterest and fiercest feelings of our nature, is to be, in fact, recreants to the principles of which such loud profession is made.

One word, and we conclude. There is a very serious consideration that does not appear to enter the minds of those who are continually assailing, directly or indirectly, the Catholic religion. Should we, the Catholics, allow ourselves to be so far irritated as to think of retaliation, what acrimony of dispute, what angry controversy, what splitting up of the liberal party, and general confusion would ensue. Yet we have as strong convictions upon religious subjects as any men, or class of men, can have. We have our own ideas of the multitude of creeds differing from ours; we entertain those ideas strongly, conscientiously, and ineffaceably. Our convictions may even rival in strength and sincerity the opinions of Lord Howick; but we see neither the necessity nor the charity, of trumpeting them forth to the universal world. In private life, friends of opposite political persuasions will, while on other subjects the greatest confidence and freedom of communication exists, carefully avoid the topic upon which they disagree, respecting what they deem each other's mistaken opinions. They know by their individual feelings, that severe and cutting remarks or ridicule, will irritate but not convince; and anxious to keep up their mutual good will, they studiously avoid the point of difference. Why should not this example be followed up in public life, in the case of religious opinions? Men are men, in public as in private. They have the same passions—the same tenacity in their convictions—the same dislike to have these last attacked and condemned. They cannot regard him as a comrade, who, on a political question, combats at their side against the common foe, but, in the pauses of the combat, turns his weapon against themselves on account of a difference of religious belief. The Catholics have not retaliated hitherto—they have borne in mind that the best evidence of sincerity in any faith, is in the practice of that charity which should be the groundwork of all—they have

patiently borne these attacks, insults, and slanders; and, with untiring generosity, they forgive and seek to forget them. But human patience has limits, and even they may be forced to retaliate. Then will indeed be the triumph of the common enemy, who will see their darling object accomplished, in the divisions among the friends of freedom and of the human race. Let us avoid this calamity—let us pass over in silence the matters on which we cannot agree, and join heart and hand when we meet upon common ground. The Tory enemy present a firm and compact front—no dissension, no disunion among them—they are watchful and ever vigilant; and though inferior in strength, as in the justice of their cause, a single breach in our ranks may admit their united phalanx, and spread destruction and dismay. If we must have a comparison of creeds, let not the controversy be in words, let us try to prove in *acts* which creed is best—which enforces and inculcates strongest and most constantly, the great guiding principles of charity and universal benevolence.

---

ART. IV.—*Théorie Analytique des Probabilités.* Par M. le Marquis de Laplace, &c. &c. 3ème édition. Paris. 1820.

MONTUCLA remarked, that if any subject might be expected to baffle the mathematician, it would be *chance*. The same might have been said of the motions of the heavenly bodies; not at the time when the first rude theories sufficiently well represented the results of still ruder observations, but while successive improvements in the latter department were overthrowing the successive attempts at the improvement of the former. In truth, the notion of chance, probability, likelihood, or by whatever name it may be called, is as much of its own nature the object of mathematical reasoning, as force or colour: it contains in itself a distinct application of the notion of relative magnitude; it is *more* or *less*, and the only difficulty (as in many other cases) lies in the assignment of the test of quantity, *how much* more or less.

Worse understood than any of the applications of mathematics, a science has been growing for a century and a half, which must end by playing even a more important part in the adjustment of social relations, than astronomy in international communication. We make this assertion most deliberately and most positively, to be controverted by some who are at least as well able to judge.

as ourselves, to be looked upon with derision by others, and with doubt by most educated men. If the public mind has not been made to feel that the preceding prophecy is actually in process of fulfilment, it is because one primary agent has not yet been awakened to a sense of the importance of his share in the work. The mathematician has done his part, and a more difficult task he never had: the statesman is only just awakened to so much as a disposition to accumulate *some* of the data which are necessary. We speak especially of England, and by the English statesman we now begin to understand all the monied and educated part of the English public. Among the liberties in which we pride ourselves, is that of refusing to the executive all the information which is necessary for it to *know the country*, or at least, a very considerable portion of the statistics necessary for large legislation. And yet we expect ministers to be accurately informed upon the bearings of every measure they propose, at a period when it is demonstrable that the greater portion of the community neither knows, nor has the means of being told, within twelve per cent., what its stake in the national property amounts to. This is a curious assertion, and we proceed to make it good.

All who hold life incomes, whether salaries or professional emoluments, and all who expect reversions, have a tenure which depends for its value upon two things—the average duration of life at *every* age (the mathematician will understand that we do not fall into the common error), and the rate of interest which money will obtain. As to the second, who will undertake to say what rate of interest actually *is* made, not by large companies, always ready with means of investment, or by clever men of business, who live in the metropolis, but by the average transactions of all who use money throughout the country? Let us only suppose it to be a question of one per cent.; that is, that it lies somewhere, say between 3 and 4 per cent. (if  $3\frac{1}{2}$  and  $4\frac{1}{2}$  be taken, it will hardly affect the final result). Now, with regard to the first point, all are agreed that the Northampton Tables are below the general average at present existing, and the Government Tables above it. The latter are so near to the Carlisle Tables, that, for our present rough purpose, the two need hardly be distinguished. What stress we are to lay on the following circumstance we hardly know, but if we take the results of a neighbouring country, Belgium, where statistical enquiries are in a state of rapid prosecution, we find the general average of the whole country to be extremely near to the mean between the Northampton and Carlisle Tables. As follows:

Age.	Mean duration of life in years.		
	On the average of the Carlisle and Northampton Tables.	M. Quetelet's Belgian Tables.	Difference.
0	31.95	32.15	+ .20
5	46.04	45.72	— .32
10	44.30	43.86	— .44
15	40.26	40.50	+ .24
20	37.45	37.34	— .11
25	34.35	34.72	+ .37
30	31.31	31.96	+ .65
35	28.34	28.93	+ .59
40	25.35	25.84	+ .49
45	22.49	22.63	+ .19
50	19.55	19.48	— .07
55	16.58	16.44	— .14
60	13.78	13.44	— .34
65	11.34	10.76	— .58
70	8.89	8.40	— .49
75	6.78	6.39	— .39
80	5.13	5.01	— .09
85	3.75	3.83	+ .08
90	2.85	3.12	+ .27
95	2.14	2.13	— .01

This agreement is remarkably close, but it is useless. We have not the means of forming an opinion as to whether life in Belgium much exceeds or falls short of that in England. By a rough calculation for the age of 40, made from M. Ansell's Table\*, we find 24½ for the mean duration of life at that age; but we are not prepared to go farther into the subject. Incidentally, we may press upon those who are actually engaged in such matters, the propriety of taking steps to ascertain what is the proper mean between the Carlisle and Northampton tables which represents the grand average of English life.

Resuming our subject, we conceive the great extremes of the question to be represented by the Carlisle table at 3 per cent.: and the Northampton table at 4 per cent. That is to say, 13 and 17 years' purchase are the limits of the remaining value of a life income in the hands of a person aged 40, supposed to have just received a year's income. Taking 15 years as the mean, we think he must be a bold man who will undertake to pronounce, for the whole country, where between 14 and 16 years the truth would lie. Or, one man with another throughout England, the value of existing interests cannot be pronounced upon within 12 per cent.

\* This table refers entirely to the labouring classes, members of Friendly Societies. It is from the work published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge.

That the preceding will be denied from all quarters, only favours our assertion. For some will lean to one table, some to another. We remain uncontradicted, so long as authorities differ to the amount which we have stated. It is true, that, for particular cases, information exists which is sufficiently accurate. The insurance offices, which deal in select lives, now stand upon a proper basis of knowledge, the permanency of which, however, rests upon their demanding what would be called, if means of information were more extensive, enormous premiums. The reason why they are not to be so styled, shows the consequences which result to the country from insufficient statistics. Let us take the instance of the Equitable Society, an insurance office which has accumulated enormous wealth. How was this accumulation made? By demanding extortionate premiums, will be the answer of many, and by taking advantage of the ignorance of those who came to insure. We deny the correctness of this view altogether. That ignorance was the parent of these riches, is evident enough; but it was an ignorance which was common both to the office and its customers, and known to the former, who were therefore obliged to make such charges as would cover, not only the risk which their tables showed with regard to the individual, but also the danger of attempting insurance at all with such limited knowledge. Having demanded premiums of which in the first instance, it was only known that they were *safe*, the result has been that they were *much more than safe*: the profit really belongs to those who now possess it, and it has been bought and paid for. The consequence to the public is, that the want of foresight in an existing government, whether blameable or not we will not undertake to pronounce, has caused a large body of subjects of the realm to make a provision for their families at the expence of some millions sterling more than was necessary for the purpose.

The same indifference to statistical information on the part of the government, or fear of the disinclination of the people to afford it, still exists and produces its effects. We see it in every large financial measure which is proposed to Parliament. The roughness of the guesses on which such plans are built, is only exceeded by the boldness of the mathematical steps by which the results are to be deduced. It is hard to say where the wedge is to be introduced into the massy obstacles which are to be cleft asunder. Shall we point to the good effects which have resulted, and do result, from the application of sound principles to actual measurement of facts? The inertness of the legislative power never attempts to originate utility, unless acted on by the pressure from without. Shall we address ourselves to the individual inhabitant

of the country, and endeavour to show him that the power which governs his interests is not knowledge? We shall find him so busily employed in watching the intentions of his rulers, that he has no time to think about their fitness to carry their intentions into useful effect. All the countries in Europe, which are in a state of commercial progress, are searching for information; while with us it is much that government should compile for the use of the legislature, just that information which the collection of the revenue brings with itself, or which the demand of individual members of the House of Commons has caused to be furnished. The tables now published by the Board of Trade, useful as they are compared with any thing which had previously existed, are but a poor provision for the growing wants of the community. We hail them, nevertheless, as harbingers of better things.

Whenever a demand arises for the creation of some new method of meeting the uncertainty of individual prospects, a process takes place which we may briefly describe as follows. To meet the chance of fundamental error, arising from ignorance of the subject, a large capital must be subscribed, as an insurance fund in case the whole speculation should fail. The subscribers of this capital are of course indemnified for the risk, by receiving a return in case of success, larger than the usual profits of capital, and proportioned to the success of the undertaking. Those who receive this benefit must pay for it; and hence the want of statistical knowledge is an immediate and direct tax upon the people, in favour of those who may be called the *ignorance-insurers*. But this is not all; the tables must be made so disadvantageous to the insurer, that some extreme and enormous case of failure must be anticipated and provided for. And though the principle of *mutual* insurance, so little understood, may ultimately destroy this disadvantage, by a return of profits, yet there remains the evil of requiring those who would stipulate for a fixed sum, and have perhaps better means of employing their money, to buy, not what they want, but a something between that and half as much again, without any very definite means of saying what it shall be.

Among the various projects of the kind, we observe one recently established, which promises to be of great utility. It is a society for providing fixed sums to be paid on account of each child of a marriage, on his or her attaining a given age, in consideration of a life premium to be paid by the father, to date from the time of marriage. We see here, firstly, the apparatus of an insuring capital; secondly, the construction of tables, superintended, it is said, by a great mathematician. Now this

mathematician, be he great or small, could not make bricks without straw, or tables without data. Doubtless he enquired, what is the average age of marriage? what are the relative numbers of such contracts made by parties at different ages? What is the number of children produced by each, on an average, and what is the average interval between their births? He need be no conjurer to see, that all this and more, was necessary for his purpose; but we must confess, we should think him one, if he found the answers to all these questions. No doubt his province was to investigate the premiums which should be paid on some supposition which the most cautious theorizer would admit to be above the mark, and to require the office to adopt them. Both the office and the insurers may thus be made safe; but neither party can undertake to say what it is which the one buys and the other sells. The nominal £100 must be something between £100 and £150, a part of the surplus being deducted in favour of the owners of the subscribed capital.

Such is the state of our commercial relations in regard to the employment of life interests for the creation of certainties. And yet we see daily valuations of such interests, to which even the courts of law are continually obliged to appeal. The office of actuary has received a legal character, though what constitutes an actuary is not defined. Without the diploma of a college, or the initiation of an apprenticeship, a class of professional arithmeticians has arisen, whose verdicts are, in fact, as binding upon our courts as those of a jury where they agree, without any distinct rule as to what is to be done when they disagree. But what is an actuary? The statute regulating Friendly Societies, requires that their rules should be certified by an "actuary or person skilled in calculation." Is the second necessarily the first, or the first necessarily the second? We do not at all quarrel with the legal uncertainty, because the consequence is, that an actuary is in fact he who is shown to be one, by the proof that men will pay him money to have his opinion. No class of men, taken as a whole, has acted with more judgment in the multifarious and important questions which have been submitted to them. They seem to have been fully aware, that in the absence of perfect information, it was at least desirable to throw the difficulties of the subject entire upon the data, and to make everything sure from that point. Nevertheless, the effect upon the world is somewhat delusive. Apply to one actuary for the value of a contingent reversion, and he answers boldly, say £2539. 14s. 7½d. Apply to another, on the same question, and his answer is as ready, say £2092. 16s. 0½d. Whence arises this difference between two men, each of whom might almost be supposed to contend for the last



farthing? One has been to the Northampton Table, and the other to the Carlisle. *There is a theory in dispute between them*, about which the public knows nothing, and each avoids distressing the mercantile man by using round numbers. For the latter, in common with the rest of the world, has got a notion, that every mathematical process must give exact results, whatever the nature of the *data* may be. But both the trader and the actuary employ a course of proceeding which, so far as it goes, is one of safety. The first is generally no mathematician, and the second very often not more so than is absolutely requisite for his purpose. Now, to know what to throw away without thereby rendering the result more imperfect than the data, is the most difficult and delicate part of the province of the mathematician. It is, therefore, most desirable that such abbreviation should not be handled by any one who is not fully competent, as well by experience in this as in other branches of practical application.

We have said that it may frequently happen, that two actuaries differ in their results, by differing on a point of theory, and it may be useful to the general reader, to point out the leading characteristics of this difference. The tables known by the name of the *Northampton Tables*, were published by Dr. Price in 1771, by means of registers kept in the town of Northampton, from the year 1741. This table, (with some theoretical alterations, for the sake of introducing equality of decrements,) is formed from 4,700 deaths at various ages, of which, however, only 2,400 occurred above the age of 20. It was formed with that degree of caution, in such matters, for which Dr. Price was distinguished; and to which, we have no doubt whatever, the community is indebted for this, that no insurance office has ever failed, nor so far as we know, ever been generally believed to be close upon failure. A bolder theorist might very easily, and upon sufficiently plausible grounds, have hazarded tables which would have retarded this important social improvement for fifty years at least. The Northampton Tables were made the basis of the transactions of all the insurance offices; and, considered as a whole, must be looked upon as a great commercial benefit to the country. But it was soon suspected that they contained defects which made them unfit to adjust the relative interests of parties at different ages, and it was frequently affirmed, that while the younger lives were represented as too low in value, the older lives were made too high.

The *Carlisle Tables* were published in 1815, by Mr. Milne, then and now actuary to the Sun Life Assurance Society. They exhibit (with theoretical alterations as before,) the results of 1,840 deaths, which took place at Carlisle between 1779 and 1787;

and 861 of these were above the age of twenty. With reference, therefore, to numbers of deaths, they are inferior in authority to the Northampton Tables, but not so much so as would be generally supposed. For it is a principle *perfectly* demonstrable, but not *easily*, that when chance selections are used for the purpose of constructing a probable general law, the degree of confidence which is to be placed in the superior numbers of one selection, does not increase with the numbers, *but with their square roots*. Thus, to construct a table which should be *twice* as good as another, *ceteris paribus*, *four* times as many deaths must be recorded; for *thrice*, *nine* times as many, and so on. Exclusive, therefore, of every circumstance except mere numbers, the goodness of the Carlisle and Northampton tables is not (for and above 20 years of age) as 861 to 2400, but as 29 to 49, or thereabouts. In every circumstance except mere numbers, Mr. Milne had the advantage of Dr. Price; and he used it with an energy which deserved distinguished success, and, as it turned out, obtained it. For there can now be no question, that the Carlisle tables represent the state of life among the better classes (in wealth) of this country with an approach towards precision which is remarkable, considering the scanty character of the materials.

Within the last few years, the two insurance offices which possessed the largest amount of experience, the Amicable and the Equitable, have published their results. The first of these dates back for more than a century, the second for more than fifty years. The selection of its lives, in the first, was, for a long time, anything but rigorous, as we are informed; the latter has always been distinguished by more than usual care in this respect. Taking the mean durations of life at different ages, a test which we have several reasons for preferring to the one in more common use, we subjoin the following table:—

Age.	Mean Duration according to the			
	Northampton.	Carlisle.	Amicable.	Equitable.
20	33·4	41·5	36·1	41·7
30	28·3	34·3	31·1	34·5
40	23·1	27·6	24·4	27·4
50	18·0	21·1	17·9	20·4
60	13·2	14·3	12·5	13·9
70	8·6	9·2	7·8	8·7
80	4·8	5·5	5·0	4·8

The Amicable Table contains 2800 deaths above the age of

20, and the Equitable 5100. On looking at these tables, we see not only a remarkable connexion between the Northampton and Amicable, and between the Carlisle and Equitable, but also some similarity between the circumstances under which each pair was made. The Northampton table is older than the Carlisle; the Amicable is on the whole older than the Equitable. The town of Northampton is shown, by the documents of Dr. Price, to be much less healthy than Carlisle, by those of Mr. Milne; the selection of the Amicable, on the whole term of its existence, was believed, before their tables appeared, to be inferior to that of the Equitable. And in both there is the same anomaly with regard to the older lives; the difference between the Carlisle and Northampton, and between the Amicable and Equitable, which is very great at 20 years of age, is materially lessened as we approach the older ages. But the particular point on which the Northampton Tables were long suspected, appears even from comparison with its own companion; for whereas at 20 years of age, the Northampton gives considerably less than the Amicable, at 60 and upwards the case is reversed. We do not speak of various other tables, as we only wish to convey to the reader who is entirely new to the question, some slight notion of the state in which we stand with respect to the results of tables.

Now the question among actuaries is this: which are the tables to be actually used in the computation of money results, those of long or of short life, the Carlisle or the Northampton? There are great authorities, so far as authorities go, on both sides of the question; and we even apprehend that some would use one table in one set of circumstances, and another in another. Discretion must decide; but in the meanwhile it is of importance that the public in general, and the courts of law in particular, should distinctly know, that the actuary does not merely deduce a result of pure arithmetic: for he has not only to use the tables, but to settle which of the conflicting tables he shall use. And this alone is frequently a question of two or three years' purchase in the value of a contingency. It has happened more than once, that litigation has been rendered more complicated, by the opposing parties producing very different opinions upon the estimated value of life interests. On what principles the judges settle the matter in such a case, we are not aware; but it most unquestionably belongs to them to inquire *what tables have been used, and why?* For the question, whether a given individual shall be considered a good or a bad life, is one which admits of being determined by evidence, and it would be much better that the court, acting upon information, should decide whether one or other table should be used, or whether any and what mean

between them should be taken, than permit such a matter to be settled by the actuaries consulted,—the point in dispute having considerable authorities on both sides. It is also to be remembered, that even the professional men consulted are not always in possession of the information necessary to decide: a case may begin, “*A person, aged fifty,*” &c. without the least information as to what the class and habits of this person may be; and parties, interested in the result, may willfully put such a case, with *algebraical* description only, for the purpose of taking into court such an opinion as may suit their purpose. We are convinced, that, in process of time, and as the eyes of the public become open to the very extensive character of the *life interests* in this country, an officer will be appointed, a new species of *Master in Chancery*, whose duty it will be to decide those points which are now settled by reading the opinions given upon *cases laid before counsel by parties*.

Among all the confusion which unfortunately exists in the ramifications of an extensive branch of the subject we are considering, there seems to us but one point which is very clear: namely, that though such progress has been made as secures safety to those who are interested *en masse*, the equitable apportionment of the relative claims of different parts of the whole, is by no means in the same state of forwardness.

The subject of probability in general, as applied to the preceding questions, may be divided into two parts; of which the knowledge of the first is easily attainable, in comparison with that of the second. The latter of the two is the guide of the former, and often the method of checking too hasty conclusions drawn from it. The mathematical analysis of the former is easy, while that of the latter is almost as complicated as the planetary theory, perhaps even more so length for length. We need hardly add, that we refer to those extensions of the subject which were first struck out by De Moivre, and which have been raised to a high degree of developement by La Placé. Of all the masterpieces of analysis, this is perhaps the least known; it does not address its powers to the consideration of a vast and prominent subject, such as astronomy or optics, but confines itself to a branch of enquiry of which the first principles are so easily mastered (in appearance), that the student who attempts the higher parts feels almost deprived of his rights when he begins to encounter the steepness of the subsequent ascent. The *Théorie des Probabilités* is the Mont Blanc of mathematical analysis; but the mountain has this advantage over the book, that there are guides always ready near the former, whereas the student has been left to his own method of encountering the latter.

The genius of Laplace was a perfect sledge hammer in bursting purely mathematical obstacles; but, like that useful instrument, it gave neither finish nor beauty to the results. In truth, in truism if the reader please, Laplace was neither Lagrange nor Euler, as every student is made to feel. The second is power and symmetry, the third power and simplicity; the first is power without either symmetry or simplicity. But, nevertheless, Laplace never attempted the investigation of a subject without leaving upon it the marks of difficulties conquered: sometimes clumsily, sometimes indirectly, always without minuteness of design or arrangement of detail; but still his end is obtained, and the difficulty is conquered. There are several circumstances connected with the writings of this great mathematician, which indicate vices peculiar to himself, and others which are common to his countrymen in general. We shall begin with one of the latter.

The first duty of a mathematical investigator, in the manner of stating his results, is the most distinct recognition of the rights of others; and this is a duty which he owes as much to himself as to others. He owes it to himself, because the value of every work diminishes with time, so far as it is a statement of principles or developement of methods; others will in time present all such information in a shape better suited to the habits of a succeeding age. But the *historical* value of a work never diminishes, but rather increases, with time; theory may be overthrown, processes may be simplified, but historical information remains, and becomes of an authority which renders it necessary to preserve and refer to any work in which it exists. No one now thinks of consulting the work of the erudite Longomontanus; while that of his contemporary Riccioli is esteemed and sought after. The reason is, that the first contains little or nothing of history, while the second is full of it. That such attention to the rights of others is due to those others, need hardly be here insisted on. Now, what we assert is, that there runs throughout most of the modern writings of the French school, a thorough and culpable indifference to the necessity of clearly stating how much has been done by the writer himself, and how much by his predecessors. We do not by any means charge them with nationality; on the contrary, they are most impartially unfair both to their own countrymen and to foreigners; we may even say, that, to a certain extent, they behave properly to the latter, while of each other they are almost uniformly neglectful. Laplace himself set the most striking example of this disingenuous practice. For instance, Lagrange, proceeding on a route suggested by a theorem of Lambert, discovered his celebrated method of expansion,

which foreigners call *Lagrange's theorem*. Other and subordinate methods (in generality only, not in utility) had been given by Taylor and Maclaurin, and are sufficiently well known by their names. Now, Laplace has occasion to demonstrate these theorems in the *Mécanique Céleste*, and how does he proceed? "Nous donnerons sur la réduction des fonctions en séries, quelques théorèmes généraux qui nous seront utiles dans la suite." (Book II. No. 20.) Would not any one imagine that these were some theorems which Laplace was producing for the first time? In the sequel, the theorem which is known to the mere beginner, as Taylor's Theorem, is described as "la formule (i) du numero 21." Let us even grant that it is natural to refer back throughout one work to any fixed previous part of it, and we have not yet done with this strange determination not to mention the writings of any other mathematician. For in the *Théorie des Probabilités*, a work totally unconnected with the one just mentioned, Lagrange's theorem has no other designation than "la formule (p) du numéro 21 du second Livre de la *Mécanique Céleste*." And there runs throughout the whole of the writings of Laplace, with the exception only of professedly historical summaries upon points which have for the most part no connexion with his own researches, a studied suppression of the names of his predecessors and contemporaries, insomuch that had he had occasion to cite a proposition of Euclid, we have little doubt it would have appeared as "le théorème que j'ai démontré dans un tel numero." The consequence is, that the student of the *Mécanique Céleste* begins by forming an estimate of its author, which is too high, even for Laplace; and ends by discovering that the author has frequently, even where he appears most original, been only using the materials, and working upon the track, of Lagrange, or some other. If the reaction be greater than it should be, and if the estimate formed of Laplace should be lower than it really ought to be, it would be no more than a proper lesson for living analysts of the same country, who, as we could easily show, if we were here concerned with their writings, have closely copied the not very creditable example of Laplace.

The preceding remarks have a particular bearing upon the *Théorie des Probabilités*, for it is in this work that the author has furnished the most decided proof of grand originality and power. It is not that the preceding fault is avoided; for to whatever extent De Moivre, Euler, or any other, had furnished either isolated results, or hints as to method of proceeding, to precisely that same extent have their names been suppressed. Nevertheless, since less had been done to master the difficulties of this subject than in the case of the theory of gravitation, it is

here that Laplace most shines as a creator of resources. It is not for us to say that, failing such predecessors as he had (Newton only excepted), he would not by his own genius have opened a route for himself. Certainly, if the power of any one man would have sufficed for the purpose, that man might have been Laplace. As it is, we can only, looking at the *Théorie des Probabilités*, in which he is most *himself*, congratulate the student upon the fact of more symmetrical heads having preceded him in his *Mécanique Céleste*. Sharing, as does the latter work, in the defects of the former, what would its five volumes have presented if Laplace had had no forerunner?

It might appear to be our intention to decry the work which we have placed at the head of this article. We cannot but demur to such a charge, because to *decry* is, we presume, to try to alter the tone of a cry already existing. Now, even meaning by the world the mathematical world, there is not a sufficient proportion of that little public which has read the work in question, to raise any such collective sound as a cry either on one side or the other. The subject of the work is, in its higher parts, comparatively isolated and detached, though admitted to be of great importance in the sciences of observation. The pure theorist has no immediate occasion for the results, as results, and therefore contents himself in many instances with a glance at the processes, sufficient for admiration, though hardly so for use. The practical observer and experimenter obtains a knowledge of results and nothing more, well knowing in most cases, that the analysis is above his reach. We could number upon the fingers of one hand, all the men we know in *Europe* who have *used* the results in their *published* writings in a manner which *makes* it clear that they could both *use* and *demonstrate*.

In pointing out, therefore, the defects of the work in question—in detaching them from the subject, and laying them upon the author—taking care at the same time to distinguish between the high praise which is due to the originality and invention of the latter, and the expression of regret that he should, like Newton, have retarded the progress of his most original views by faults of style and manner—we conceive that we are doing good service, not only to the subject itself, but even to the fame of its investigator. If, at the same time, we can render it somewhat more accessible to the student, and help to create a larger class of readers, we are forwarding the creation of the opinion that the results of this theory, in its more abstruse parts, may and should be made both practical and useful, even in the restricted and commercial sense of the former term. Such must

be the impression of all who have examined the evidence for this theory.

It is not our intention to conclude the subject in the present number; the length of this article (for such articles should not be very long) warns us to conclude for the present by finishing our account of the difficulties which have been placed in the way of the student, previously to entering upon the consideration of the subject matter of the treatise.

The *Théorie des Probabilités* consists of three great divisions. 1. An introductory essay, explanatory of general principles and results, without any appearance of mathematical symbols. 2. A purely mathematical introduction, developing the analytical methods which are finally to be employed. 3. The application of the second part to the details of the solution of questions connected with probabilities. The first of these has been also published in a separate form, under the title of *Essai Philosophique*, &c., and is comparatively well known. Our business here is mostly with the second and third. The arrangement will seem simple and natural, but there is a secret which does not appear immediately, and refers to a point which distinguishes this and several other works from most of the same magnitude. The work is not an independent treatment of the subject, but a collection of memoirs taken *verbatim* from those which the author had previously inserted in the Transactions of the Academy of Sciences. Thus in the volume for 1782, appears a paper on the valuation of functions of very high numbers, with an historical and explanatory introduction. Now this introduction being omitted, the rest of the memoir is, substantially, and for the most part word for word, inserted in the work we are now describing. And the same may be said of other memoirs published at a later period: so that the *Théorie des Probabilités*, first published in 1812, may be considered as a collection of the various papers which had appeared in the Transactions cited from 1778 up to 1812.

This materially alters the view which must be taken of the treatise, considered as intended for the mathematical student. It also makes a change in the idea which must be formed of the real difficulty of the subject, as distinguished from that which is actually found in reading Laplace. The course taken has both its advantages and disadvantages; on which it may be worth while to say a few words.

Of the highest and most vigorous class of mathematical students, it may be easily guessed that they are most benefitted by the works which are least intended for them. Complete digestion and arrangement, so far from being essential to aid them in the



formation of power, are rather injurious. The best writer is he who shows most clearly by his process where the difficulty lies, and who meets it in the most direct manner. All the artifice by which the road is smoothed and levelled, all the contrivance by which difficulty is actually overcome without perception of its existence, though a desirable study for the proficient, and most useful with reference to the application of the science, is a loss of advantageous prospect to the student who wishes to become an original investigator. An officer who has never seen any but well-drilled soldiers, may *command* an army of them: but he who would *raise* an army must have been used to the machine he wishes to create in every stage of its process of creation, from a disorderly assembly of clowns up to a completely organized force. It is on such a ground as this that we take our stand, when we say that Euler, from the almost infantine simplicity with which he presents the most difficult subjects, and Lagrange, from the unattainable combination of power and generality which he uses *for* (more than *through*) the student, are not the best guides for one who would practice investigation. It is Laplace whose writings we should recommend for this purpose, for those very reasons which induce us to point him out as one of the most rough and clumsy of mathematical writers. A student is more likely, *pro ingenio suo*, to be able to imitate Laplace by reading Laplace, than Lagrange by Lagrange, or Euler by Euler.

In the next place, of all the works which any one has produced, the most effective for the formation of original power are those which lie nearest to his own source of invention. All the difference between analysis and synthesis will exist, for the most part, between the memoir in which the discoverer opened his views for the first time, and the ultimate method which he considered as most favourable for their deduction from his first principles. Hence we should recommend to the student to leave the elementary works and the arranged treatises as soon as possible, and betake himself to the original memoirs. He will find them not only absolutely more clear than compilations from them, but what is of much more importance, they state with distinctness what has been done on each particular point, and what is attempted to be done. If there should arise confusion from the student not perceiving that he is employed upon an isolated part of a whole which is not yet complete, there are safeguards in the *Memoir* which do not exist in the *Treatise*. Take any work on the differential calculus, from the time of Leibnitz downwards, and the formality of chapters, distinction of subjects, and treatment of nothing but what is complete, or appears so, will leave

the impression that the whole is exhausted, and that all apparent difficulty arises from the student not being able to see all that is presented to him. Now the fact is that in many cases the obstacle is of another kind, namely, that the reader is not made aware that there is more to be looked for than is presented. The assertion, *je n'en sais rien*, by which Lagrange frequently astonished those who imagined that a grand mathematician knew every thing, is frequently embodied in the spirit, or enspirited into the body, of a memoir, but seldom into that of a formal treatise. It happened to us not long ago to be very much puzzled with the account of a process given in the great work of Lacroix, one of the best of methodical writers. Chance threw in our way the original memoir of Legendre, from which the process was taken, and we found that, word for word nearly, the former writer agreed with the latter, so far as he went. But a few sentences of omission in which the original writer had limited himself, were, it should seem, inconsistent with the vastness of the general design indicated in the heading of the excellent compiler's chapter. The difficulty vanished at once, since it merely arose from venturing to hint to ourselves, in the way of doubt, precisely what the original writer had proposed as a limitation.

So far then, as the great work we have before us preserves the actual contents of the original memoirs, it must be looked upon as very wholesome exercise for the student. But there are still some defects, arising from not completing the plan. The short historical notice and general explanation is omitted, in consequence, we suppose, of the humiliation which the writer of a treatise would feel, were he compelled to name another man. The extravagance of an original memoir lights the candle at both ends; not only is an author permitted to say clearly where he ends, but also where he began. Did Stirling give a result which might have afforded a hint as to the direction in which more was to be looked for? Laplace may and does confess it in the Transactions of the Academy. But the economy of a finished work will not permit such freedoms; and while on the one hand the student has no direct reason for supposing that there ever *will be* any body but Laplace, he has, on the other, no means of knowing that there ever *was* any body but Laplace.

In the next place, the difficulty of the subject is materially increased by the practice of placing general descriptions at the beginning, instead of the end. Our present work begins with a tremendous account of the theory of generating functions, which we doubt not has deterred many a reader, who has imagined that it was necessary to master this first part of the work before

proceeding to the rest. And why is this obstacle placed in the way? Because there was an old memoir ready to reprint from. And where in the subsequent part of the work is it used? In some isolated problems connected with gambling, which in the first place might be omitted without rendering the material part of the work more difficult; and in the second place are applications of the theory of generating functions of so simple a character, that the preliminaries connected with it might be discussed in two pages. And in what future part of the work do the very tedious (though skilful) methods of development become useful which are formally treated in the introductory chapter? Nowhere.

Hence the reader may begin to suspect that the difficulty of this work does not lie entirely in the subject, but is to be attributed in great part to the author's method. That such difficulty is in part wholesome, may be very true; but it is also discouraging, unless the student be distinctly informed upon its cause and character. Believing as we do that in spite of all we have said, the *Théorie des Probabilités* is one of the points to which the attention of the future analyst should be directed, as soon as the subject is in any way within his power, we shall here finish what we have to say on the character of the work, and proceed in a future article with that of its results.

ART. V.—1. *De la Démocratie en Amérique*. Par Alexis de Tocqueville, Avocat à la Cour Royale de Paris, l'un des Auteurs du Livre intitulé "Du Système Pénitentière aux Etats Unis." Bruxelles, 1835.

2. *The Americans in their Moral, Social, and Political Relations*. By Francis J. Grund. London, 1837.

THE United States of North America have been, and are, every day, becoming more and more the subject of European attention. The experiment of a new form of Government there in progress—the magnificent scale on which that experiment has been essayed—the contrasts and comparisons which occur between the state of things there and in the countries of the old continent—all these points furnish matter for infinite and incessant speculation, and diversity of opinion. Theorists and "practical men," political parties of every shade and hue, all, with common consent, refer to America for examples to bear out their

respective doctrines. The speculatist enlarges upon the leading principles of the American constitution, and their development present and future. He compares them with the institutions of his own hemisphere, and strains the comparison in favour of either, according to his own predilections. The man, who eschews theory, pursues those principles through all the details of their working, and predicts boldly on the fate of the grand experiment from the operation, for good or evil, of its minor parts. The Conservative pounces with eagerness upon any defect that he can discover,—and every casual failure, or imperfect success, of the provisions for good government, is loudly proclaimed to the world; while all that gives hope of obtaining that great end, is passed over by him in most significant silence. The Reformer, according to the degree of his liberalism, appeals with moderate, or triumphant confidence to the example of America, to prove, that the freer the institutions—the happier and the more prosperous must a nation be.

It is in England that this attention has been peculiarly excited, as might naturally be expected, from the affinity that exists between her and her quondam colonies. Almost equally naturally this attention has been a good deal sharpened by jealousy. The parent state did not easily brook to be outstripped by her offspring in the development of the long (and *wilfully*) misunderstood art of good government. England had been too long and too much in advance of other nations, to be content with now seeing herself left behind. Neither was it at first a pleasant sight to behold American fleets stretching into seas once furrowed by British keels alone, and bearing the fruits of American industry and enterprise, to vie with, and perhaps excel, the productions of the mother country in remote markets that had hitherto been supplied solely by the latter. The incipient ill-feeling was assiduously fanned by the enemies of freedom, whose foul interest it was, that division and disunion should exist between the promoters of universal liberty. Although, happily, now on the wane, this jealousy yet subsists, and so strong as not to be surmounted without an effort by many men even of liberal minds. But the majority of this description have long conquered the unworthy feeling, and rejoice sincerely in the prosperity of America. With them, other and better motives give the impulse to an examination of her condition and prospects. They know that the great experiment in progress in that country, is one fraught with the deepest and most intimate interest to the well-being not only of the existing generation, but of millions yet unborn. The past history of mankind details many sorrows and much suffering, the consequence and effects of evils inherent in

bygone, or subsisting, institutions; to myriads life has been but a wintry day, because of the oppressions and the crimes of those who held the reins of irresponsible and irresistible authority. A new order of things has commenced on the other side of the Atlantic; men find protection there from everything save the consequences of their own delinquencies; and, eagerly and anxiously, those who wish well to their kind are watching for all indications that the liberty and happiness that the new system has already produced, are likely to spread and to endure.

Actuated by one or other of the motives alluded to, a multitude of writers in light literature, in pamphlets and newspapers, in magazines and reviews, have been busy with America, its manners, government, and people. The opinions they put forward are as diversified as the channels through which they give them to the public. But the activity of our awakened attention has not stopped here—a number of persons have determined to see and judge for themselves. Visitors have passed over into America, very many of them doubtless appertaining to that class which the author of “Pencilings by the Way” describes as “the tribe of bagmen and runners,” and whose remarks and observations are reserved for their own particular circles, but also some who have, “greatly daring,” written a book, and narrated to the world what they have seen and what they have thought, during their pilgrimage. Captain Basil Hall, Mrs. Trollope, Hamilton, Stuart, Vigne, Mrs. Butler, better known as Fanny Kemble, Power, the celebrated Irish actor, &c. &c. are names that will at once suggest themselves to our readers. Of these, the works of the two ladies, and of Mr. Power, are of a light nature, intended chiefly for amusement, and, in the case of Mrs. Trollope, for the purposes of satire. The latter lady, indeed, if recent accounts are to be credited, has not written without some effect of a certain degree of importance. Her occasional sharp truths (few and far between), enveloped as they are in a thousand exaggerations, have, we are told, wounded not a little the vanity of the nation whose domestic manners she professed to depict, and have led, through very shame, to a visible improvement, where the offensive peculiarities she ridiculed did really exist. It would be well if her recent tale, ‘Jonathan Jefferson Whitlaw,’ which claims some consideration for the goodness of its motive, in laying open to execration the horrors of negro slavery in the southern states of the Union, had anything approaching to an equal effect. With regard to those points where, in her first production, she is, without reason or cause, severe, the best antidote will be found in the light and pleasantly written Tour of Mr. Power. Throughout his pages, a liberal

and gentlemanly spirit prevails that does him much credit. Captain Hall's work was one of a more serious nature than these, and heavy and dull to a degree that was not expected from the pen of that generally entertaining writer. It was written with a political object—brought out at a crisis when the long predominant spirit of Toryism was tottering on his throne; its main object and intention was to check the growing demand for improvement of our institutions, by endeavouring to prove the bad success in America of the principles on which those improvements were to be based. But he wrote as a partizan, and the public knew him to be such. Accordingly, his writings made no other impression than does the speech of any brawler at a Conservative meeting. His assertions were disbelieved—his fallacies detected. What he may have advanced that had good foundation, shared in the disregard which the spirit that pervaded the whole work drew upon it, and it is now as little read and as little thought of, as a political squib, after the election that gave it birth has passed over. Mr. Vigne's book is the hasty narrative of a six months' visit to North America, with a large portion of it occupied by remarks on the British possessions on that continent. His object would seem to have been rather to furnish materials for his readers to form their own judgments, than to express any very decided opinion of his own. In fact, he tells us plainly in his concluding words, "judge for yourselves." At the same time, upon certain subjects, such as extension of the suffrage, a hereditary branch of the legislature, &c. &c., he hazards an opinion, which, however, we would be very sorry to recommend the reader to adopt, especially in the present times. In justice to Mr. Vigne, it must be allowed, that, so far as the collecting of information goes, he appears to have made very excellent use of his time.

We hurry over these, and other writers,\* to notice two more recent publications of striking interest, and very great merit. The first, in order of dates, of the publications in question, has proceeded from the pen of a French author, M. Alexis de Tocqueville. His work is one of patient, calm, and philosophical research, and has, as it deserves, attracted so much attention, that it is already quoted, as a book of reference, by writers and by public speakers. He informs us in his preface, that he conceived the idea of writing, after having studied, in America, her social condition, and comparing the equality that pervades all, and influences all there, with the same principle gradually struggling upward to the same eminence in Europe; while its consequence, democracy, triumphant in the former Continent, is visibly advancing towards a similar domination in the latter. He well says,

that this advance is not to be checked by the efforts of our generation, when the generations that have preceded us have failed in the attempt,—and that all that now remains, and what constitutes the pressing and chiefest duty of those who are at the head of affairs in the countries of the old world, is—

“Instruire la démocratie, ranimer s’il se peut ses croyances, purifier ses mœurs, régler ses mouvemens, substituer peu à peu la science des affaires à son inexpérience, la connaissance de ses vrais intérêts à ses aveugles instincts : adapter son gouvernement aux temps et aux lieux ; et le modifier suivant les circonstances et les hommes.”

For some sound and sensible reflections on the state of his native country, France, we would refer the reader to the rest of the preface, as well as to different passages in the body of the work itself.

The first volume of “*La Démocratie en Amérique*,” is dedicated to an examination of the institutions, written laws, and general condition of the body politic, in the United States. His second is of a more speculative character. He considers democracy as it is, in all its bearings, workings, and effects,—the causes which tend to its support, and the various influences that act upon it, increasing, or moderating its inherent violence, and, finally, he casts an eye towards the mighty future that is reserved for America. The whole is written, as we have said, in a thoroughly philosophical spirit, and if, at times, the natural bias of the aristocratic ideas that surround Europeans from their birth, makes itself visible (as in his strictures on the “*aspect vulgaire*” of the lower chamber of Congress, &c. &c.), it can well be passed over, when we take into account the general absence of prejudice, and liberality of spirit, that pervade M. de Tocqueville’s pages. His delineation of the constitution of the United States is clear and full of interest, and his remarks upon it, and upon its influence and effects on the community, are, for the most part, well grounded, and worthy of serious and attentive consideration. Altogether, the book is one that ought to find a place in every library, and entitles its author to a high rank among those who labour for the enlightenment and improvement of the age in which they live.

Although his tone is in general favourable to the Americans and their institutions, yet it sometimes appears to be what his fellow-countrymen would call “*mal-assuré*” upon some parts of his subject, and he occasionally appears to be but half in earnest in his objections, and anxious to supply an answer to them himself. In his first volume, after having shown the excellence of the federal system, he expresses doubts and fears concerning it, and seems to tremble at the idea of the great variety of knowledge

and the clear powers of discernment which he considers it to require in those under its dominion. Hence, he anticipates that it would not be found generally to suit the nations of the earth. Yet his statement that he has found in the Americans the requisite knowledge and enlightenment, and "the fact confessed by himself of the facility with which they meet and get successfully over whatever difficulties at any time result from the complication of the system, would lead us to the inference, which he himself indirectly admits, that nations have but to become enlightened to render the adoption, by them, of a similar constitution, safe and practicable. In his second volume he dwells very fully upon the nature of political associations. He represents them as dangerous, yet admits that they have not produced any bad effects in America; and confesses that, even in the case of the convention formed in 1831, by the States of the South, aggrieved by the Tariff promulgated the preceding year, even then, while irritation and excitement were at their height, the proceedings were marked by moderation of language, and strictly confined to the object of meeting—viz. a denunciation of the unconstitutional nature of the measure in question, and a declaration of the interest which all nations, and the United States in particular, had in the freedom of trade, violated by the Tariff. It does seem strange that a man of his intelligence and general justness of views should deduce from this convention such a consequence as he does (page 43), where he states it to be probable that the convention exercised much influence in the minds of the discontented, and prepared them for the open revolt of the succeeding year. How much more likely, that if such a vent had not been given to the indignant feelings of the Southern States, this revolt would have occurred earlier, preventing a full discussion of the matters at issue, and causing a protracted and bloody struggle. That it did occur at all is solely owing to the obstinacy of the general legislature—futile, and calculated to bring contempt upon its authors, as all such obstinacy proves to be, when opposed to the just demands of a large portion of a community. In the end, the General Legislature had to concede, and most ingloriously; for the South Carolinians (most active in the matter, as most injured) would not allow the redress to be accompanied by any declaration that might tend to save the wounded honour of Congress. Here then was a case of right—arms were not appealed to until the constitutional means of petition and political association had failed, in consequence of the ill-judged obstinacy of the Northern interest; and yet M. de Tocqueville would persuade us, that the revolt was occasioned chiefly by the conven-



tion. Still he does not go the length of positively condemning political associations—he says they are sometimes necessary.

“ Dans les pays où ils n'existent point, si les particuliers ne peuvent créer artificiellement et momentanément quelque chose qui leur ressemble, je n'aperçois plus de digue à aucune tyrannie.”—p. 42.

He then proceeds to compare these associations in Europe and America :

“ La plupart des Européens voient encore dans l'association une arme de guerre qu'on forme à la hâte pour aller l'essayer aussitôt sur un champ de bataille. . . . Les membres de ces associations répondent à un mot d'ordre comme des soldats en campagne ; en s'unissant ils font le sacrifice entier de leur jugement et de leur libre arbitre.

“ Cela diminue beaucoup leur force morale. Elles perdent ainsi le caractère sacré qui s'attache à la lutte des opprimés contre les oppresseurs.”—pp. 44, 48.

What he here describes are *not* political associations, as Europeans understand them, but as the insane tyranny of Louis Philippe constrains the French nation to form them. To omit, as he does in his allusion to Europe, all notice of associations in Ireland, is something very like leaving out the part of Hamlet. Our country could afford him a noble example of the use, not the abuse, of the right of meeting. It cannot be that M. de Tocqueville had not read, or heard, of the Catholic Association. Created at a time when half Ireland, distracted by poverty and grinding laws, was in a state of open insurrection—when the minds of the upper orders of the insulted Catholics, pained by the excesses of their wretched fellow-religionists (whom they knew to be goaded into desperation by want and suffering), and wounded to the quick by the insane denial of their rights, were turning with reluctant, but determined hearts, to the dreadful alternative of civil war to accomplish their liberties—no sooner was the safety-valve of the Catholic Association opened, than the pent-up elements of terror and confusion gave place to the moderate and well-regulated moral power that at length forced from a bigotted parliament, an inimical ministry, and an unwilling monarch, the achievement of Political Emancipation.

We hasten over minor matters, to consider what may be called our author's favourite topic—what he designates as “The tyranny of the majority.” From some quarters, we should have received this phrase as *cant*. It is a favourite one with Conservative writers and orators, who stigmatise with it every effort of the popular will that tends to baffle their designs. Few things are more fresh in our recollection than the bugbear use which Lord Stanley made of this expression, during the debates

upon the shameful Coercion Bill for Ireland. His pretence and his excuse for the most disgraceful of the provisions contained in that most despotic and atrocious measure, each alike, was to guard against the "tyranny" in Ireland of "the many." It may be remarked, that he and his present associates, the Tories, take especial care never to include in their denunciations the "tyranny of the *few*." But M. de Tocqueville has not been looking for clap-trap phrases—he has had but one thing in view—viz. a calm and thorough investigation of his subject, and he has endeavoured sincerely, and, in a great measure, succeeded in divesting his mind of all prejudices that might interfere with this investigation.

He states, that he views the "omnipotence of the majority" in America, with much distrust and disrelish; and asserts, that as it increases, so does also every inherent vice of democratic institutions. We cannot in this join him except to a very small extent. There may be cases when the power of the majority needs a check of some description. But what shall this check be, and where is it to be found? Are these not extreme cases, and must not something be allowed for the imperfection from which neither man, nor any of his works, can be totally exempt? What the majority of a nation choose to do, they have, speaking generally, a right to do, inasmuch as they are a majority—and the will of the minority ought to bend before them. In America, the minority have every possible means given them by the constitution to make their complaints known, and to endeavour to increase their adherents. The press is totally unfettered—the right of political association is held sacred—the right of representation in Congress is most fully acknowledged; and if, by these means, they cannot accomplish what they desire, it is fitting that they should submit. The very fact of their continuing a minority, of their not being able to work out the object they have in view, is strong presumptive proof that they are in the wrong. The case of the Southern States, in the question of the Tariff, was an extreme case, and, for such, a sound political maxim tells us there is no legislating. Yet in the end the power of truth prevailed—the Southern obtained the repeal of the obnoxious provisions, and thus may every minority, *whose cause is right*, be assured that, finally, justice will be triumphant. In our author's speculations on this subject, he does appear to us to be peculiarly actuated by that spirit to which we have before alluded, which leads him to start objections and suggest defects only one half in earnest, and, speedily after, seek to answer them himself. There is none of this hesitation when he comes to state the advantages of a democratic form of government, to which particular branch

of his subject he devotes many pages in his second volume, besides numerous passing allusions in other places. In the outset of his dissertation upon the "omnipotence of the majority," he would seem to feel thoroughly the distrust and disrelish that he professes; yet an attentive perusal of *all* that he writes on that head will leave the reader much in doubt at the end, as to the strength and permanence of those feelings in M. de Tocqueville's mind.

Two very important questions of a purely speculative nature are agitated in the latter half of his second volume—the one, what may be the destiny of the three distinct races that form the population of North America; the other, the future history of her institutions. It is scarcely necessary to say, that the three races our author alludes to are those of the white man, the Indian, and the negro. Of the two last, (between whom there is but one thing in common, their suffering from the first-named race, they being in all other matters as distinct and as different as possibly can be conceived,) he draws a melancholy, but, unfortunately, too true a picture. Year after year sees the hapless Indian forced farther and farther from the graves of his ancestors, and the hunting grounds that once his nation held. If he tarry among the stranger race that have seized upon his ancient possessions, he becomes, alas! too often, a degraded being, imbued with the lowest vices attendant on civilization, ere he has had time, or means, to gain any of its benefits. If in the sullenness of his Indian pride and his inflexible hatred towards the "lying palefaces," he retire among the western deserts to escape their contamination and preserve his independence, scarce a year will have passed over his head ere his solitudes are invaded, and he sees himself suddenly surrounded by the busy "pioneers" of the hated race. In vain the federal government seeks to protect the rights of the Indians. The local governments of the States invade and outrage them at every step; and all that can be done is to mitigate the misery of the Indians' forced emigration, by defraying, out of the national treasury, the expenses of transporting them to wilds yet undefiled by the whiteman's tread. But this miserable refuge will not always be available—the descendants of the strangers are stretching fast to the westward, and must in time occupy the whole Continent, from ocean to ocean—the descendants of the ancient possessors of the soil are retreating before this advance, their numbers every year diminishing by wars amongst themselves, by the toils of their forced exile, by hunger, by pestilence; and they must at length disappear altogether from the face of that Continent, over which their fathers roamed the undisputed masters. The negro's fate is more doubtful; but while his actual and past condition is and

was far worse than that of the independent Indian, there are yet some bright hopes of his future that are utterly denied to the latter. That slavery will cease utterly in North America, there can be no shadow of doubt. The most determined and inveterate upholder of the accursed system, limits his utmost hopes to the simple one, that the necessity may be staved off during his lifetime; yet, with the general conviction that slavery must end, there is one great question undecided—what is to be done with the enfranchised blacks? A general fusion of the two races, our author says, is not to be hoped for. The base, but indomitable, prejudices of the Anglo-Americans, deny all chance of such a result. Even in the States where enfranchisement has already taken place, there is no symptom of amalgamation, but, on the contrary, a marked and shameful distinction carefully kept up. Infamy is attached to intermarriages with the negroes. The latter are endowed with all the rights of citizens, but such is the force of public opinion that they dare not exercise them. In places of amusement—in public conveyances—in the churches—even in the last resting places of the human kind, the cemeteries, the blacks must be kept apart from the haughty whites. The race thus proscribed are, according to M. de Tocqueville, gradually disappearing from the northern States. Slavery began in the south, and spread itself to the north. It is now retrograding, and as it recedes, the negro race seem to retire with it towards the tropic regions, whence it came. Our author ascribes this to several causes. The prohibition of the sale of slaves in the north, and of importation from the south, were among the chiefest of these causes; the first forcing the slave holder of the former region to seek a market in the latter, and the second preventing the drain thus made from being supplied by fresh arrivals. But the most powerful cause was competition of free labourers, whose labour was found to be beyond calculation more productive. In the south, then, the immense mass of the negro population is congregated, and there a fearful and an ominous silence prevails on that question of all-engrossing and most vital interest—what is to be done with this population? This silence is the more impressive, as it contrasts with the loud and anxious discussion of the subject in the northern parts of the union, and as each day the horizon lowers more and more with the coming storm. One means of safety, entire and complete, is visible, but at a sacrifice. Will it be adopted at once, or left to the operation of time?

“Peut-être arrivera-t-il à la race blanche du sud ce qui est arrivé aux Maures d'Espagne. Après avoir occupé le pays pendant des siècles, elle se retirera enfin peu à peu vers la contrée d'où ses aïeux sont autrefois venus, abandonnant aux nègres un pays que la Providence semble

destinér à ceux-ci, puisqu'ils y vivent sans peine et y travaillent plus facilement que les blancs."

Whatever be the expedient, humanity will not suffer it to be long delayed. On the subject of slavery there can be no compromise; and beyond the indispensable precautions for the welfare and regulation of those about to be made free, there ought to be no delay. Every hour that the negro is detained in bondage, accumulates a heavy debt, and the retribution will be terrible. It is this accursed system that will give birth to the real dangers of the Union, and that casts a blot upon the fame of America that centuries will not wipe out.

The permanence of the present North American confederacy seems to M. de Tocqueville a matter of doubt; and his idea is, that instead of returning to the condition of separate, independent States, several unions of a smaller kind will be formed out of the *débris* of the present. Considering the extent of territory, which it is the destiny of the Anglo-Americans one day to occupy, his theory wears a probable face. This breaking up into smaller circles *may* happen, but at best is a remote contingency. As yet matters have gone on well—trade flourishing, manufactures improving, peasantry comfortable—and instead of a crushing national debt, an actual *surplus* (and one for which the last message of General Jackson informs us there is a difficulty in finding employment) in the national coffers. All States are beginning to feel the folly of divisions and contentions, and to recognize their true interests in a concord that allows the free interchange of trade; for commerce is the strongest link that can bind men together. To commercial interests war is ruin, and separations cause injurious and often fatal interruptions. The States of America will be at peace with each other, each for its own sake. The general government having nothing to do but foster and protect the freedom of trade, will not come into collision with individual portions of the Union; and the increased facilities of communication afforded by railroads, will remove much of the inconvenience of the great distances between the seat of central government, and the more distant territories. A splitting up may, as we have said, take place, but is by no means inevitable.

We have scarcely left ourselves room to notice a very recent English publication, entitled "The Americans in their Moral, Social and Political Relations, by Francis J. Grund." This is a book that does honour to the writer, and will well repay the trouble of perusal. There is in its pages none of that bad spirit which English writers on the United States too often indulge in, and which generates a fund of ill feeling between our quondam colonies and the mother country. Mr. Grund strongly and

justly reprobates such a spirit, to which he tells us the Americans are never the first to give way. He makes particular mention of their "strong prejudice in favour of the English nation," and the especial kindness with which they receive English tourists. However, they will make no sacrifice of their own self-respect; and although "ready to associate with Englishmen on terms of *equality*, and willing to consider them as part of their own family, they will not pardon overweening conceit, and are most unpromising on questions of a national complexion . . . . they are peculiarly sensitive with regard to the offences of the English."—vol i. p. 38.

Mr. Grund's considerations on American society, literature, dramatic taste, and progress of education, breathe the most liberal spirit, and differ most widely indeed (but not wider than is the truth) from the ungenerous and unfounded aspersions to be met with in the pages of some other writers on America. He proves, what, indeed, is generally known, that Mrs. Trollope's pictures of society are but grossly exaggerated representations of society in what, in this country, would be called the middle classes; the higher classes being shut to her. He brings *facts* to destroy the assertions of Tory writers as to the low condition of American literature and taste; gives data marking the progress of education; and in every point he undertakes, he establishes a triumphant case.

As we have alluded to the reception of foreigners, we cannot pass over a point so important to our poor Irish fellow-countrymen as the reception they meet in the United States. He informs us, that though the Americans give the Irish their sympathies as an oppressed and injured people, yet the very fact of their working hard for low wages, and being easily contented and happy if they have the necessaries of life, renders them less acceptable to the aspiring and money-seeking natives of the land of their emigration. The Americans cannot understand, and in some degree condemn, those who can be so easily satisfied; and this contempt has grown into a prejudice that has led some States to make provisions against the importation of "Irish paupers." Yet Mr. Grund says, that, "considered collectively, the Irish form a highly useful part of the community, and contribute, by their honest industry, to increase the wealth of the country." Every true Irishman must feel grateful to this author for his remarks on the order and good dispositions of our poor emigrated countrymen, and on their excellent conduct when some time settled. Much of the ill feeling towards them is borne only by a party, and that in consequence of political opinions; the Irish, from their recollections of suffering from the opposite

form of government, being ardent partizans of democracy, to which the party alluded to is opposed.

Mr. Grund's advice to Irish emigrants is so good, that we cannot refrain from inserting it, and would that we could make it reach the ears of those poor fellows who are daily leaving for ever their native land, to seek a refuge and a home in the United States :—

"Let the Irish, on arrival, be, above all things, careful not to disturb the peace by revels of any kind : the Americans are proud of voluntary submission to the laws, and cannot respect those who infringe them, or are given to excess. Let them abstain from all share in political quarrels, before they are able to form a correct opinion on the subject. Let them refrain from violence of any kind, even though provoked. If they are wronged, let them appeal to the law, and the Americans will assuredly procure them justice ; for the Americans love peace, and liberty, and justice more than any people in the world."—p. 97.

Let the Irish follow these rules, our author says (as those of them in Boston have already begun to do), and they will make for themselves a home and fast friends at the other side of the Atlantic.

In the very brief notice that our limits enable us to give of the rest of this valuable work, we could not, perhaps, do better than allow Mr. Grund's general opinions on America to appear in his own words :—

"The American commonwealth consists of a community of reason and good sense ; its empire, therefore, is the largest, and its basis the most unalterable on which the prosperity of a people was ever established. . . . The Americans have kept good faith with all nations ; and, with the most unexampled economy, have discharged their national debt. Their credit is unrivalled, their honour unquestioned, and the most implicit confidence is placed in their ability to fulfil their engagements. They have not monopolized a single branch of industry, but let foreigners and natives compete fairly.\* They have established liberty of conscience, abolished all hereditary privileges, and let all start free and equal. In short, they have made their country the market for talent, ingenuity, industry, and every honest kind of exertion. . . . There are no conflicting elements that threaten an immediate change or overthrow of her established institutions. . . . As long as these latter are productive of such happy results, it is but natural that the people should cling to them as the principal cause of their boundless national prosperity."—vol. i. p. 262, 272, 273, 280.

In conclusion, we would heartily recommend to such of our readers as are desirous of obtaining a good and sound knowledge on the subject of America, to peruse attentively and weigh well the works of M. de Tocqueville and Mr. Grund. The principles laid down in either, and the effects deduced from certain

causes, may not always seem right and sound, but the reader may be assured that he will meet with no ebullitions of prejudice, and that, if there be mistakes, they are those of candid, liberal, and enlightened minds. These works are full of valuable and interesting information, and will supply the amplest materials for the most practical comparison with the institutions of our own or other countries, as well as for the most speculative consideration of the present state and future destiny of the New World.

---

ART. VI.—1. *The Daughter*. A Play, in Five Acts. By James Sheridan Knowles, author of “*Virginius*,” &c. London, 1837.

2. *Cosmo de’ Medici*. An Historical Tragedy. By R. H. Horne, author of “*The Exposition of the False Medium*,” &c. London, 1837.

3. *Marcus Manlius*. A Tragedy, in Five Acts. By David Elwin Colombine. London, 1837.

THE English drama has undergone a series of transitions during the last fifty years, which, for variety, frequency, and contrast, are unparalleled in the drama of any country in Europe during the same, or any former period. A glance at the state of the stage in France, Spain, and Germany, will sufficiently prove the correctness of this assertion.

The classical school was rigorously observed, even so late as the reign of Louis XVIII, by all the writers for the theatre in France. Boileau, Racine, Corneille, and Voltaire, who implicitly followed the laws of Aristotle and his successors, were the models for modern imitation, and it was not until very recently that those extraordinary innovations were introduced, which have completely changed the character of the French stage. Even Victor Hugo and Alexander Dumas, who are at the head of the Romantic school, and who have carried its extravagance farther than any of their contemporaries, commenced their careers with plays which, although they do not strictly fulfil the conditions of the Stagyrte, and are deformed by some eccentricities, must still be regarded as belonging, in a certain degree, to that more sober and weighty class of dramas which has of late been altogether superseded. The “*Hernani*” of Hugo, written in the antiquated and restrictive form of rhyme, and the “*Henry III*,” of Dumas, written in prose, display some respect for order in the



distribution of the action, and for the higher style of the elder poets in the tone of the dialogue, and the general treatment of the subject; but both Hugo and Dumas have subsequently abandoned even these concessions to system in their numerous and successful productions, falling at last into the worst excesses of an impure taste, and openly outraging, not merely improbability, which might admit of some slender excuse, but the decencies of life, which admits of none. It is to be observed, however, that the decline of the French drama, from the chaste, but cold and stilted elevation of Racine and Corneille, to the coarse levities and monstrous incongruities of such playwrights as Scribe and Delavigne, has been a gradual course of decadence in a particular direction: it was not marked by any features of incidental novelty, or checked by divergence into other channels. It was a constant progress towards the emancipation of the stage from all rules and trammels, whether of art or morality; and, except that it acquired increased impunity, and betrayed still deeper laxity as it proceeded, it displayed no farther transitions than were necessarily included in the general tendency of its altered spirit.

The drama of Spain presents a still slighter deviation from its original condition. Lope de Vega and Calderon, especially the former, (whose inedited MSS. are in quantity treble the amount of his published works, and who is said to have produced eight hundred pieces on the stage), did not very scrupulously adhere, even in their most elaborate dramas, to the laws of the ancients, but, yielding to the licentious taste of their age, surrendered themselves to an exuberance which could not be restrained within the established limits. These poets being the earliest standards of Spanish dramatic literature, the present state of the Spanish stage, in which, unquestionably, even the show of regularity and decorum is not affected, cannot be considered to involve any more grave dereliction from the period of its highest excellence, than an extension of the license which was adopted by the first Spanish dramatists. Nor, indeed, has the character of the Spanish theatre undergone any greater change than may be easily accounted for by the universal changes in habits and institutions to which the country itself has been exposed.

In Germany, the stage has hardly yet secured a fixed and definite reputation. The literature of that thinking and acquisitive people is but the growth of yesterday; and until the appearance of Lessing and Klopstock, who may be said to have dissolved the ice that locked up the springs of thought and poetry, the national mind was unrepresented both in books and plays. When the theatre at last became of some importance, two dif-

ferent styles struggled together into existence—the grave, but picturesque, genius of Schiller at the head of one, and the motley and sentimental imagination of Kotzebue originating the other—followed by such contemptible play-wrights as Grillparzer (*der Schauspielschreiber*, contra-distinguished from *der Schauspieldichter*), and the rest of the inventors of mere spectacles.

Our stage alone, then, has suffered a succession of novel mutations; which are rendered the more remarkable by the fact, that the English drama exhibits, in its purest and best manifestations, none of those rigid and repulsive models from which, in France at least, they had some excuse for venturing to depart. We disowned the authority of Aristotle at once, and began with nature. The field was vast and inexhaustible: we were not shackled by any limitations, or oppressive formulæ; we were not required to torture humanity into a prescribed shape; we cast away the Procrustian bed, and gave the figure in its original, living proportions. We, therefore, had no reasonable pretext to offer for going in search of ingenious absurdities, for surrendering our judgment to temporary expedients, that exercised no worthier influence than as they captivated the fancy of the multitude, and that were equally obnoxious to the stern creations of the ancients, and the freer, and bolder, and more natural productions of our own school. It may be said, perhaps, that, having no arbitrary laws, and being amenable to no settled system, such deviations are incidental to the nature of our drama, which is, in itself, irregular and capricious; but this argument is as illogical as it is untrue. The fact, that our drama is irregular and capricious, cannot be admitted in justification of every species of irregularity and caprice; for it must be obvious, that if we proceeded upon such a principle, there would be no bounds to the incongruities it would introduce, since there could be no definition of the extent to which one irregularity might be justified by another. Nor does it follow, because our drama is not governed by arbitrary laws, and is not amenable to a settled system, that, therefore, such deviations are incidental to its nature. It certainly does not exact the observance of the unities: the few instances—take Addison's "Cato" as an example—in which they are attempted to be followed, are found to be unfit for the stage, because they contradict, not merely our own experience, but that of all social intercourse throughout civilized Europe. The only instances in which the Greek tragic drama, with its interpolated and explanatory chorus, has been imitated in our language, were especially intended for the closet, and could not be represented upon the stage without risking a trans-

formation of the sublime into the ridiculous. It is true that our drama does not recognize any express restraints in the conduct of the action, the regulation of the time, or the choice and change of place: in one of his plays, Shakspeare introduces upon the scene a grown woman, who is supposed to have been born in the preceding act; in another he shifts the scene, within the same act, from Britain to Rome: and he comprises the events of a period of seventeen years in a third. These are by no means the most striking examples which might be selected from the English stage, of contempt for classical usages; a multitude of still more curious instances might easily be accumulated to the same purpose, were it not superfluous to attest an admitted truth by a crowd of familiar illustrations. But all such violations of the laws of antiquity refer exclusively to the construction, and not to the materials of the play. The characters are still retained in all their original breadth and power; there is no sacrifice to false splendour, or meretricious effects: truth is preserved entire, sometimes exhibited in minute detail, and sometimes in its general features, but never distorted or set aside. It is in the plan, therefore, and not in the elements that enter into the substance of the play, that our drama is irregular and capricious. The ground-work is nature,—the most comprehensive, the most fertile in varieties, and the most accessible to criticism that can be conceived. And this leads us directly to the consideration of the difference between the irregularities that have been introduced of late years upon our stage, and those which constitute the difference between what we call our legitimate drama, and the drama of the ancients.

It would carry us out of our way to enter at any length upon the influence which the doctrine of Necessity—the mysterious power of an inexorable Fate—exercises over the conduct of the Greek tragedy, and to which, according to some high authorities, much of its sublimity may be referred. The enquiry is one of deep interest, and would demand more space and consideration than the subject before us requires. It is enough for our present purpose to observe, that the operation of an invincible Destiny—such as that which, for the fulfilment, no doubt, of an awful and overwhelming retribution, devoted the whole Argive house to destruction—relieved the Greek poets from the necessity of exhibiting in the action of their plays a sufficient body of motives to account for the deeds of the persons of the drama. An irresistible Fatality urged them into crime. It was not requisite to satisfy the moral sense by the exhibition of adequate human causes for the perpetration of enormous guilt: it was sufficient that an overruling power worked unseen, and controlled the progress of events. In

a drama so constructed—which left nothing exposed to the modification of circumstances, which exhibited, not the struggle of the passions against earthly temptations, but against Fate itself, and which delineated men not as moving by their own impulses, but under the direction of an arbitrary and irreversible will—a large portion of time, and a wide space for action, were not only needless to the production of its ends, but would have marred the grand simplicity of its design. Immutable destiny does not need a long term, nor a fluctuation of scenes, to accomplish its behests. The briefer the period, the more condensed the action, within which the catastrophe is accomplished, the more impressive must be its effect. But the limitations that, for these reasons, enhanced the dignity of the Greek tragedy, would obviously operate very differently upon a drama which professes to describe humanity under another aspect, governed by human motives, alternately creating and overcoming the circumstances by which it is surrounded, and moving always in an atmosphere of free-will. Such a drama demands that sufficing causes shall be set forth for the acts of the persons engaged upon the scene; and it would be clearly impossible to unfold such causes, especially where the issues are of deep interest and of great magnitude, within the bounds prescribed by the canons of antiquity. In the drama of Nature, human motives take the place of the Destiny of the Greek drama. It is essential that they should be luminously displayed in their origin; that the progress of their influence should be fully portrayed; and that their results should be vindicated through a complete development of natural and cumulative events. That, therefore, which was consistent with the spirit of the Greek drama, which was inherent in its constitution, and which contributed mainly to the production of its final triumph, would be inconsistent, extraneous, and hurtful to the truth of a drama which rejects the machinery of such personages as Nemesis and Ate. Nor would it be difficult to prove that the very irregularities with which the English drama is chargeable, when it is tested by laws to which, as we have attempted to show, it is not properly amenable, are, in fact, not only unavoidable, but indispensable; that they are derived from the great original it is intended to reflect; and that if they were dismissed in deference to a code of abstract regulations, it would be to imprison nature in the dogmas of art, and to deprive it of its moral power by limiting its range and diminishing its reality.

But, although they do not come within the reach of the ancient laws, they are nevertheless subjected to a standard quite as severe, and which, unlike the Aristotelian test, may be applied, and is unconsciously applied, by the multitude at large. That standard

is simply their agreement with nature—their *vraisemblance*—their likelihood. This, indeed, is the final examination by which their propriety, as well as their actual merit, is tried and adjudicated. So long as the inconstancy of the plan is reconcilable with probability—so long as it is reasonable in itself, and in relation to the particular incidents with which it is connected—no just objection can be raised against it on the ground of its departure from any critical authority whatever. We unhesitatingly claim this privilege in its fullest acceptation for our national drama, and shall be prepared to justify it against any exceptions with which it may be assailed. A question of taste is, of course, always opened as to the choice of subject; and the propriety of its treatment must be considered in two points of view—first, in reference to the especial nature of the subject itself, and second, in reference to general truth. But if we find that the disturbances of any or of all the unities, are conducted with a due regard to homogeneity, internal and external, they must be held, agreeably to their principles, to be perfectly legitimate. While Hamlet realizes the attributes with which the poet desired to invest him, and does not pass out of that individuality which Shakspeare has impressed upon him in a greater degree than upon any other character he has drawn,\* it cannot be considered a violation of dramatic probability, since it is not a violation of human probability, that, during the progress of the action, Hamlet is presumed to have accomplished a voyage from Denmark to England, and back again: but if Shakspeare had exhibited the deck of the vessel, and shewn, as in a panorama, the course of the voyage, the occupations of the sailors, the relief of the watches, the soundings, and the tacking of the ship, then the patience of the audience would be worn out, the illusion would be destroyed, and the absurdity of the representation would become palpable. Again; if Hermione, resolving into warm life from motionless marble, were to dance or sing, the exquisite pathos of the scene would be converted into farce, and the ridiculous would supervene upon one of the most affecting incidents in a story of marvellous interest. Or—to take an example of another kind—had Shakspeare (from whom we desire to draw all our examples) strictly obeyed the wishes of Queen Elizabeth, who, according to Rowe, commanded him to shew Falstaff in

---

\* Victor Hugo, in his preface to "Mary Tudor," says of Hamlet, that he "is Hamlet, not you or me, but us all. Hamlet is not a man, he is man." This is pure affectation, and asserted from a sheer love of paradox. Nor is it false merely in reference to all possible poetical creations, but it is especially false in reference to Hamlet, who is not even the representative of a class, but emphatically of an individual nature.

love, he would have exhibited an anomaly full of such inward and direct contradictions, that the true characteristics of that strange creation, the self-centering appetites, the lazy humour, and unctious recklessness, must have evaporated in the process : there may never, perhaps, have been such a man as Shakspeare has delineated in Falstaff, but there might have been such a man, for his whole nature is conformity with itself; but there never *could* have been such a man, had the poet conferred upon him a single ray of real tenderness, or probity.

That, therefore, which we call irregular in our drama, is clearly irregular only as a departure from regulations which are not founded in nature, and not as a departure from nature itself. But it is the irregularity which violates nature that constitutes the offence of our modern drama. This is the distinction we desire to draw, and it is to this point especially that we are anxious to direct attention. To work out stage results by absurd or improbable means—to elevate the mean into a position of false and meretricious dignity—to sacrifice the *vraisemblable* in individual character to the production of striking effects in the grouping of the whole—to distract the obvious course of the action by extravagant episodes—to overlay the scene with superfluous incidents—and to render that paramount to the interest of the main design, which is properly accessorial and subordinate—are items in the long catalogue of sins which are chargeable upon our modern drama.

The introduction of these vicious novelties may be regarded as the total abandonment of all standards of judgment. When we consented to forego the test of nature—which every man's sympathy with the business of the scene will enable him to apply more or less profoundly—and began to crave for mere splendour and electrical surprises in its place, there was no longer a means by which the intrinsic excellence of dramatic productions could be fairly tried. And when the public taste was once cast upon the vast sea of invention, without compass or chart, it was, of course, impossible to divine into what remote harbours, or upon what unexplored coasts, it might be drifted. The whole purpose of the playwrights was to dazzle and astonish; and in their efforts to transcend each other in the new and the surprising, an extraordinary variety of styles and modes followed in rapid succession, the people adopting for the time the tone of the last folly that happened to be in vogue. We do not now allude to any of those preposterous spectacles that have occasionally degraded our national stage, but to the different classes of plays that during half a century have occupied the theatre, almost to the exclusion of the works of the dramatic poets who flourished

in the period embraced between the accession of Elizabeth and the death of Charles the Second.

The actual demise of that school of English comedy which truly reflected the manners of society, cannot be accurately dated. It fell away by degrees. But Congreve was the last of its most distinguished heads. His successors put less actual life into their pieces, and depended more on the play and frivolity of the dialogue, than on the internal strength and truth of the materials. And here we may remark, that the popular complaint which is so frequently made in fleeting criticisms about the neglect of our old comedies, is founded in a total misapprehension of the subject. That which is true in reference to dramas of passion, is not necessarily true in reference to dramas that represent the tone and conduct of society. The objects to which tragedy is addressed are in their nature permanent and unalterable: the object of comedy is to exhibit fugitive and temporary traits. While the former, therefore, is equally intelligible throughout all generations, the latter is acceptable only in the age for which it is designed, and in which its allusions are palpable and true. The difference lies between the nature of man which is always affected by the same emotions, varied only by the influences which move them, and his artificial habitudes, which are constantly changing. The agonics of Othello will be understood by remotest posterity—Captain Flash and Fribble are obsolete already. An illustration of these essential distinctions is furnished in the admirable comedy of the "Provoked Husband," which felicitously combines them both. The gradual alienation of Lady Townley's domestic affections by the vice of gambling, and the progress of Lord Townley's misgivings, terminating in the final act of atonement, possess an interest that will always continue to touch the feelings of the audience—while the whole of the Wronghead family, the journey to town, the blundering simplicity of Moody, and the miscalculations of the country baronet, are, in our day, tolerated only for their eccentricity. But, although such is the character of genuine comedy, which limits its province and restrains its influence within periodical bounds, there are some comedies which might be revived with advantage, for the sake of the truth of their portraits, the force of the moral, and the universality of their wit. These, however, are exceptions, and are classed under the head to which they are assigned, only by convention. •

The last comedy which appeared to fulfil the expectations created by this description of drama, was Sheridan's "School for Scandal;" but, much as we are indisposed to deprive that play of a fraction of the popularity it acquired at once upon its pro-

duction, and which it has maintained ever since, we cannot affect to be insensible to the fact that it is one of the most artificial plays, both in its construction and its dialogue, that is to be found in our own or in any other language. It flashes all through with premeditated points—all the characters speak in the same spirit of repartee—even the footman epigrammatizes after the fashion of his master—and sparkling antitheses glitter all over the surface. The mere assimilation of the language to all varieties of persons, takes it out of the pale of common life, and the dialogue is so ornate and brilliant, that it certainly never had its prototype in real conversation. The adjustment, also, of the scenes, the preparation for effects, the *contre-temps*, and the contrasts, betray the excessive art with which it was designed. That, too, which seems to constitute its wit, is, in truth, not wit at all, but something, as Congreve remarked of a comedy of Cibber's, which is very *like* wit. It seldom springs from the occasion, but, on the contrary, the occasion is made on purpose to exhibit it; and it has such an air of *skill*, that it is impossible not to perceive that it is a succession of ingenious contrivances to take the spectator by surprise. The perpetual recurrence, however, of these satirical and pungent brevities, keeps the audience constantly on the *qui vive*, and, in addition to the actual merits of the piece, which are numerous and by no means superficial, answer the chief end of a popular representation just as well as one of the best comedies of the inimitable Wycherly did in his licentious age.

But since the time of Sheridan, comedy may be said to have disappeared from the stage. We possess nothing even so good as the comedies of Murphy, who understood, better than any dramatist of subsequent years, that artful expedient which the Italians call the *imbroglio*, and which, by a singular and startling transposition, has been latterly infused into plays of a serious character. "All in the Wrong" is almost a perfect specimen of that description of involved action, and "The Rivals," amongst more recent productions, approaches nearest to it in that sort of excellence. A variety of dramatic modes have usurped the place of comedy. The first broad deviation from its recognized characteristics was in the school of sentimental comedy, founded by Kelly, to whom the distinction must be granted of having written the first maudlin mixture of buffoonery and verbal pathos that was ever represented on our stage. The sickly sensibility of the characters, who were either paragons of virtue, or social monsters—the triteness of the morality—the frothy apostrophes to honour—the superfine tenderness—the melting charities—the unbounded generosity—and the flowery and magniloquent



verbiage—were irresistibly ludicrous. It was not alone that these plays were absolutely unnatural, but that they weakened the original strength of the small scrap of moral truth which they sometimes illustrated, by diluting it in a stream of namby-pamby conceits. The sentimental comedy did not flourish long in its pristine completeness; but it was partially restored, from time to time, in pieces in which its chief elements were combined with materials of another kind. Messrs. Morton and Reynolds were the founders of this description of comedy, which expanded the features of extravagant farce into the tedious distribution of five somnolent acts. When we recall to memory the exquisite farces that were produced by Garrick and our English Aristophanes, —as Foote has, not inappropriately, been designated,—it is not saying too much to declare that they were better entitled to take rank amongst our genuine comedies than any one of the multifarious brood of five-act drolleries engendered by the genius of those gentlemen. They were, at all events, worthy of being called *commedinas*; the essential essence of which certainly none of the others possessed. The influence which the comedies of Messrs. Morton and Reynolds exercised upon the public taste, must be regarded with surprise as well as regret. It is now many years since those pieces were upon the list of stock-plays, as well as the dramatic productions of George Colman, the Younger, which, although much more various, and, on the whole, more skilful and *vraisemblable*, may, for the greater part, be justly drawn into the same category; yet an audience of the present day could not patiently sit out their representation. This is, perhaps, partially to be attributed to the lack of the kind of talent, or eccentricity, which is requisite in such performances, but mainly to the intrinsic absurdity of the plays themselves. "It was then—as it still continues to be in some of our minor theatres—the usual practice of our popular dramatists to write pieces to suit the peculiarities of particular actors. Thus, whatever was extravagant in the manner of a favourite performer, was encouraged to its height; and that which was originally but an accident in the individual, came by degrees to be cultivated into a style. The actor was carefully measured, and nature was cut down, enlarged, or distorted in her proportions, to make her fit him. The old usage was reserved, and the player, instead of being called upon to study character and adapt himself to its demands, was converted into the model from which character was to be drawn. It was impossible that plays which were thus planned, could present pictures of real life; they were, in fact, transcripts of the worst excesses of stage mannerism worked up into consecutive scenes; and as the individual actors for whom

they were designed vanished from the stage, their temporary interest expired, and their shallowness became more and more apparent. *Equivoque*, that fruitful resource of the French stage, was plentifully employed in these pieces, and carried to such lengths, that a quiet perusal in the closet of some of those dialogues in which two persons are set to play at verbal cross purposes, that might be cleared up by a single word of explanation, is calculated to create unfeigned astonishment at the merriment which they produced when their internal absurdity was aggravated by the grimace of the stage. In one of the comedies of George Colman, the Younger, a respectable sombre gentleman is introduced in conversation with a new-made lord—a man of low and vulgar habits, who has by a sudden freak of fortune been elevated to the peerage. The gentleman believes that he is in the presence of the former lord, who has been described to him as an accomplished and dignified person. The object of his visit is to disclose some family intelligence of a painful nature. The lord, mistaking the purport of the communication for something of a very different kind, receives it in a spirit of coarse humour that shocks the feelings of his visitor, who is utterly confounded by the tone and language of his lordship. The mistakes that spring out of this—the forced antitheses—the confusion of terms—and the broad and senseless jokes that accumulate throughout the scene, exhibit so much tasteless and vapid ribaldry, that nothing less than a revolution of the public taste could have preserved the play upon the stage.

The importation of pieces from Germany gave another and a different turn to our drama. But, unfortunately, our translators began at the wrong end, and instead of attempting to adapt such pieces as the “Don Carlos” of Schiller, to the stage, they drew their inspiration from the mosaic productions of Kotzebue, in which the most egregious errors of false sentiment were fused in a style so fantastic, that the spectator, if he would enjoy the meretricious in perfection, was compelled to follow Lord Chesterfield’s advice, and leave his judgment at the door. Those dramas of Kotzebue, which were rendered into English, took possession of the public at once. Their finery—their exclamatory pathos—their intermixture of the wild and the common-place—their affectation of simplicity—and their jejune morality, (which is nothing better than a morbid pretence of virtue,) were new and striking. Half-educated minds were captivated by this surface of sensibility, and as the world had previously been absorbed by the “Paul et Virginie” of St. Pierre, the “Attila” of Châteaubriand, and the “Werther” of Goethe, so the universal attention was, for a time, concentrated upon the sickly plays of Kotzebue.

One of the most remarkable instances of the popularity of these pieces was that of "Pizarro," which was in some degree remodelled by Sheridan, who interpolated it with passages (the speech of Rolla to the Peruvians, for example), that forced the spirit of the drama into greater extravagance than even the author had contemplated. The success of "Pizarro" on our stage was extraordinary; the enthusiasm of the public was unbounded; and the play-wrights, who had thus discovered a new and easy way to the plaudits of the multitude, were not slow to improve upon the hint. Even Holcroft, who was capable of better things, produced a comedy in which English characters were so thoroughly *Germanized*, that the costume of the play was totally at variance with the sentiments and the tone of the general expression. It is to this fertile soil of fanciful conceits that we are indebted for the numerous heterogeneous compromises between tragedy and farce that have ever since, with little intermission, filled the stage. In those productions, the main object of the dramatist is to keep the audience constantly vibrating between extremes, and to distract rather than to fix attention. The suddenness and violence with which the scenes alternate from the depths of woe to the giddiest whirl of joy, agitate and occupy the promiscuous assembly, who are not permitted sufficient room or repose for the exercise of reflection. The success of this tumultuous appeal to the emotions of the multitude, is in proportion to the extravagance of its characteristics. Having once become accustomed to tawdry excesses upon the stage, the appetite of the public acquires an unnatural relish for bombast; and, consequently, invention is strained for expedients to satisfy the inordinate demand. In this way a thousand anomalies are produced—a variety of devices to fill the eyes and the ears are resorted to—and when the power of creating fresh surprises would seem to be exhausted, a surprise, still more extraordinary than all the rest, is contrived, by the union in a single piece of the clap-traps that were previously scattered through several. We have one melodrama which embraces such a fatiguing variety of stage artifices, that it seems to have been specially constructed, less for the purpose of evolving the events of a plot, than of demonstrating the amazing quantity of mere trick and fustian the public can endure within the constrained limits of three acts. In this piece, which is quite a miracle of its kind, and the story of which is as remote from probability as the agencies through which it is developed are complicated and preposterous, the spectator, in the compass of an hour and a half, is treated to a snow-storm, a conflagration, a shipwreck, trap-doors of all sorts, disguises, songs, dances, thunder in a variety of forms, abduction,

escape-ladders, combustible hogsheads, forests, drawing-rooms, caverns, every imaginable alternation of the seasons, and all possible degrees of light and darkness, from sunrise to midnight.

We do not object to these expedients because they are in themselves objectionable, but because they are employed so profusely and inopportunately, as to cast into shadow the more important features of the drama. The phenomena of nature, the ordinary stratagems of life by which any desired results are produced, and the accidents that occasionally give excitement to existence, may be resorted to, not only with propriety, but are frequently inseparable from the necessary conduct of the scene; when, however, they are so crowded into the canvass, as to render the living figures that appear upon it secondary in importance, it must be evident, that the place of the dramatist is usurped by the scene-painter, the machinist, and the property-man, who may, in truth, claim all such representations as exclusively their own. This tempts us into a slight digression upon a peculiar feature in the dramas of Joanna Baillie, which, indirectly, bears upon the point, but which, at least to our knowledge, has never been touched upon by her critics. After a careful perusal of those admirable plays, it is impossible not to be struck by the fact, that they are singularly *picturesque*; that while the passions dissected in the plot are exhibited with a vigour, which it is difficult to associate with our general impressions of the power and tendency of female genius, the accessories of the story, the scenes, the language, and the minor details, possess, in an eminent degree, the highest beauties of the picturesque. Old ruins, towers clad with ivy, night watches, storied chambers, haunted places, the recesses of woods, recollections of the chivalry of the middle ages, wild traditions, and superstitious terrors, pervade her plays. These are the obvious creations of a fine poetical feeling, coming in to heighten the effect of that, which, in itself, is grand and natural, and which, without them, would still subsist on the strength of its own truth, but which derives from their aid an additional hold upon the imagination. It is worthy of observation, that, rich and exquisite as these embellishments are, they never interfere with the onward progress of the action, nor divert the reader from the actual business of the play; on the contrary, they enhance the interest, and spread such a fascination over the subject, that, without perceiving the flowers that are momentarily springing up, as it were, at our feet, we are conscious only of the aroma they diffuse through the air. This is the true use of pictorial auxiliaries—not to overpower the essential elements of the drama, but to enhance their effect.

Strange as the expedients we have indicated must appear to

those persons, whose critical notions of dramatic literature are formed in the closet, we are indebted to the French for some still more ingenious contrivances to impart novelty to theatrical performances. Our aptitude for transplanting to our own stage all the peculiarities that flourish in every other country, is remarkable. Of late years, we have exhibited a marvellous disinclination to confine ourselves to our own manor, and appear to have imbibed a vagrant propensity for poaching on the preserves of our neighbours. During the American war, and the brilliant era of Nelson's victories, we certainly did originate something like a national amusement, although it could hardly be considered to be dramatic. The genius of Dibdin discovered a new region of delight which was purely English. His little entertainments, composed of a mixture of recitations, songs, and music, were addressed to the spirit of the times, and stimulated the enthusiasm of the people, at a time of considerable public excitement. The universal ardour for military and naval glory, was also infused into the regular productions of the theatre, by such writers as Cherry, the comedian, who, in his comedy of "The Soldier's Daughter," seized upon the popular feeling, and reflected it, sufficiently exaggerated, upon the stage. But these representations of the prevalent subject of the day, were temporary in their nature, and in their execution feeble and superficial. When they had served the immediate purpose for which they were designed, they could no longer maintain their place before the public. Like popular songs that ring perpetually in our ears during the fury of the occasion they celebrate, they passed away into oblivion, so soon as the circumstances that produced them had subsided. We might as well expect to hear the old ballad of "Carle, an' the King come," revived in our streets, as to find such pieces as "The Naval Triumph" restored to our stage.

Our obligations to the French are so well known to every play-goer, that it would be a very frivolous expenditure of time to enter upon a description of the anomalous, and, in many instances, reprehensible, absurdities we have so freely borrowed from that versatile people. The peculiar character of the French—their flippancy, inconstancy, their restlessness, and their love of excitement and display—are exhibited with fidelity upon their stage, which certainly has given birth to a more extraordinary progeny of incredible curiosities than the world ever witnessed before. It is not alone that they make perilous attempts to embody palpably before the eyes the most wondrous conceptions of the Ideal, and that they venture to pourtray the last extremities of the Real in the minutest and most painful details, but that they do not hesitate, occasionally, to trespass on those sacred

domains, which, except in the early ages of Christianity, when plays were the exponents of scripture-history, it has always been considered profane to employ for mimetic uses. Some notion of the lengths to which this desecrating pursuit after variety has been carried, may be formed from the fact, that so recently as the year 1816, the sacrifice of Isaac was rendered into the subject of a ballet on the Parisian boards. The admiration of crowded houses rewarded the agility of Samson, who, to the great delight of the audience, danced a solo, while he supported the gates of Gaza on his shoulders, and was taken unawares in the mazes of a fandango by the treacherous Philistines, after Dalilah had effected her theft upon his locks during the pauses of the dance!

But it cannot be denied that we have derived some advantages from the French drama, as well as many follies and vices. If we could but acquire the art of using those advantages with discretion, they might ultimately lead to more extensive improvements than can at present be readily conjectured. There is no doubt that the French dress their stage with more accuracy and correctness than we do—that in all the minor appointments, and in the combination of the parts that constitute an effective whole, they possess superior tact. The French ballet is perfect; there is nothing wanted to give to that species of entertainment all the zest of which it is susceptible. It is true, that the expenditure lavished upon that department, is much greater than its intrinsic interest can ever reward; but the hint it affords of the capabilities of stage representations ought not to be slighted on that account. If the same care and costliness were bestowed upon an historical play, what grand results might not be produced. We are not forgetful of the efforts which were made by the late Mr. Kemble, and which were assiduously followed up by Mr. Charles Kemble, to bestow upon the plays of Shakspeare, at least as much splendor as managers did not hesitate to give to the performance of such pieces as “Blue Beard,” and “Timour the Tartar;” and that the public did not recompense, simply because they did not discern the merits of the experiment. But we had not then advanced so far into the age of spectacles as we have since done, nor had we then sufficient skill in these matters, to unite, as we might now do, all the artistical resources of the theatre in one great design for the illustration of dramatic poetry. We can well conceive with what effect Shakspeare’s series of English historical plays might now be produced, and we are much mistaken if a requisite attention to costume, scenery, and incidental accessories, would not be amply repaid by the lovers of our national theatre. Our experience is so enlarged, and our facilities are so much encreased,

that the expense of thus attempting to revivify the noblest specimens of our drama, would be comparatively trifling.

In the construction of modern plays we have availed ourselves, rather too profusely, of the ingenuity discovered by the French dramatists in the exhibition of living *tableaux*, and in the suspension of the action, and its prolongation over an unusual period of time. Of these somewhat startling contrivances much may be said *pour et contre*: but the discussion would carry us too far out of our way at present, and will furnish, with more propriety, a subject for separate consideration. The *tableaux* are generally extraneous, and are introduced so undisguisedly for the purpose of heightening the immediate effect of the scene, that they cannot be regarded otherwise than as a paltry artifice to captivate the groundlings. But occasions may arise where such pictorial aid is justifiable, and where it may form even a natural, as it is a pleasing, feature: but these occasions are rare, and they ought to be embraced with a scrupulous judgment. The suspension of the action of a play, by suffering long intervals of years to elapse between the acts, during which the persons of the drama are supposed to have undergone the ordinary revolutions of age, opens a question of greater moment to the true interests of the drama than may appear upon a hasty and superficial survey. The obvious influence which a play, so contrived, exercises upon an audience, is similar to that of a legend:—a large demand is made upon the imagination; we are required to supply the void with figures and accompaniments, furnished agreeably to the impressions that have been made upon us; we are, in some sort, associated in the design with the poet himself; we are called upon to share in the labour of invention, to take a direct personal interest in the dim and troubled future, to conjecture from what has been, what may be, or ought to be; and when we see again the same faces we saw before, saddened by the scathe of years, or flushed by the prosperous growth of fortune, our speculations take a wider range, and we are led away into reflections upon the mutability of our common state, more or less tinged by the hue of the events and their issues which the dramatist has unravelled. Plays of this description form a new school: they are totally unlike every other kind of drama—they are subservient to different laws—they appeal by very different means to the feelings and sympathies—they exhibit not an event, or events, but a whole life—they rely upon the faith of the spectator—and they are calculated, not merely to move his passions, but to awaken trains of rumination. It is evident that dramas, so peculiar in their nature, must be written with great skill to save them from the destiny of these vulgar and shallow exhibitions, that act only upon

the ignorance and superstition of the uneducated classes. Depending wholly upon the treatment of the subject, their claims cannot be adjudicated by a reference to general principles. But we have said enough to shew that they are not unworthy of more elaborate examination, especially as they have already affected, to some extent, the tone of our stage.

From the whole body of these remarks one general inference may be drawn; that (without attempting to classify the various styles and forms of dramas that have been introduced from time to time, succeeding and displacing each other with unexampled rapidity) we have gradually departed from the cultivation of nature, and have adopted in its stead a school of artificial expedients. The great object of the writers for the theatres is to produce theatrical effects. This is too often done at the immediate expense of all likelihood, not only in the plot, but of consistency in individual character; and the public have become so accustomed to look for it as one of the essential ingredients in a modern play, that it would now be a perilous experiment to attempt a drama upon the stage which should rely for success solely upon its innate truth.

That the loftiest conception may be materially assisted by ingenious *situation*—a word, coined expressly to designate a happy combination of those elements that enter into a scene, so as to constitute, at a particular moment, a pictorial group, a *contre-temps*, or any other striking or highly-wrought effects that come suddenly upon the spectator—cannot be denied; and if we examine closely the texture of the best scenes in the old comedies—"Much ado about Nothing," and the "Comedy of Errors," for example—we shall find that they abound with *situations*. But in none of these cases does the situation overpower the interest of the main subject, or take to itself any share of the admiration that is due to the action from which it springs. In our modern drama, however, situation is all in all. The whole design of a scene is frequently limited to the production of some unexpected *tableau* at the close; and the spectator is carried through a rapid dialogue, that, perhaps, does not in the slightest degree advance the progress of the plot, solely for the purpose of bringing about a stage catastrophe, that could not be accomplished by the ordinary and obvious course of things. This custom was fast growing up into such excess, that at last plays were constructed which contained little else than a succession of bold scenic effects, to which every other consideration was secondary and subservient.

Mr. Sheridan Knowles was the first author who conceived the felicitous thought of attempting to unite the two requisites of the old and the existing drama—nature and stage effect. In the efforts



of every previous writer for the theatre, either the one or the other was inevitably sacrificed, and, until the appearance of "Virginus," there was no piece presented to the public, in which these apparently incongruous qualities were reconciled, and rendered mutually illustrative. Mr. Knowles had been for many years acquainted practically with the stage, before he commenced his career as a dramatic author. His experience as an actor, and the opportunities of analyzing the subtle machinery of our elder poets, which his avocations as a lecturer afforded him, prepared him for a task, which certainly no living writer could have executed with so much skill and success. Mr. Knowles's dialogues are rarely remarkable for mere poetical beauties, for that would have been inconsistent with his main design; but they possess a vitality, an earnestness, a closeness, and a direct simplicity, that require the auxiliaries of costume and action to draw them out in their full meaning. They belong essentially to the class of stage-plays, contra-distinguished from those that may be read, and equally felt, in the closet. In the management of his subjects, the same attention to the demands of actual representation is observed. He always seizes upon the prominent features of the plot, and makes them the landmarks of its progress; and no natural or probable means are left untried to work up the interest of the scene to its height, without sacrificing the internal truth of the delineation to artificial accessories. That he has not completely succeeded in the combination which his dramas are palpably intended to accomplish, is partly to be attributed to the great difficulty of controlling artistical contrivances, so as that they shall not interrupt the natural development of passion; and partly to the elaborateness with which he has treated them, in order to avoid that difficulty.

It is a curious fact, that in every one of Mr. Knowles's plays, with, perhaps, the single exception of the "Hunchback," which is, in all respects, his finest and most complete production, there is a striking defect in the adjustment of the story upon which the drama is founded. He either begins the action of the play prematurely, or carries it beyond the point where the interest properly terminates. We cannot suppose that Mr. Knowles is unconscious of a peculiarity which is not confined to one or two of his dramas, but which, with the single exception we have pointed out, is common to them all; nor can we refer it to any want of aptitude in detecting the precise bearings of his plots, since few dramatists have exhibited more skill in lighting rapidly upon the salient points, and developing the capabilities of a subject. But we suspect that the cause of this singular maldistribution of the action may be traced to some inherent temptation to stage effect, or some pathetic incident, which lurked in

the previous or succeeding portions of the story, and which he could not altogether prevail upon himself to surrender. Thus, in the play of "The Wife," the whole of the first act is superfluous to the actual business of the drama, which does not commence until after the events exhibited in that act are completely wound up; and the audience begin, in fact, with a new spring of interest which wells up in the second act, and continues to flow until the close. There are thus two distinct sources of interest—the loves and union of the hero and heroine, and the trials to which they are subsequently exposed, and which form the real subject of the play. The first act, however, is so exquisitely written—the journey of the betrothed and devoted girl to Mantua, is so full of suspense, and her description of her devotion is so pure, so true, and so touching, that we imagine we perceive in its intense and absorbing beauty, the magnet that drew Mr. Knowles out of the prescribed bounds of the legend he had undertaken to dramatise. A similar instance of another kind is furnished in the "Virginius," the legitimate catastrophe of which takes place with the death of Virginia in the forum, at the end of the fourth act. After that event it is impossible to sustain the attention of the spectator. Everything that follows is inferior in importance, and the play, instead of rising to a climax, droops under the weight of a supererogatory finale, which not even its wild and fearful character, and the most eminent powers of acting can redeem. Yet there seems to be no doubt that Mr. Knowles's appreciation of mere stage effect seduced him into this glaring error. The figure of Virginius discovered, as the scene draws, kneeling in an attitude of horrid stupefaction over the murdered body of Appius Claudius, and the affecting restoration of his consciousness at the sight of the urn containing the ashes of his daughter, suggest at once the *tableaux* that induced the dramatist to extend the play beyond the point at which the leading interest ceases.

The reception of Mr. Knowles's dramas has produced other pieces of a similar nature, in which his example has been industriously imitated; and, indeed, from the appearance of the "Virginius," we may date the commencement of a new school of dramatic writing, in which, while the higher characteristics of poetry are attempted to be preserved, something is conceded to the prevailing taste of the day. At best this is a compromise, into which we are forced by what we cannot help considering the deterioration of the public taste; but if it ultimately prove to be a barrier to protect us against any farther inroads, we shall have no reason to regret that it has already received the sanction of writers whose powers afford us fair promise that it shall be sustained at as high a tone as it is susceptible of receiving.

The three dramas, with the names of which we have headed this article, have been avowedly written with this object in view. One of them is the production of Mr. Knowles, and has already been subjected to the ordeal of the stage with very indifferent success: the others, addressed to subjects of a more ambitious description, are expressly constructed for representation, a test to which they have not yet been submitted. We will give a brief analysis of each, which, taken in connexion with our preceding observations, will help still farther to illustrate the present condition of our modern drama.

The same objection that has been taken to Victor Hugo for dramatising the *Causes Célèbres*, and converting the theatre into the *Cour d'Assises*, may be urged against Mr. Sheridan Knowles, for selecting, as the subject of a drama, a story that properly belongs to the annals of Newgate, and that would have been better adjudicated at the Old Bailey. This is, so far as our recollection serves us, the first time that such a plot has been elevated to the dignity of blank verse; nor, until we had perused this play, could we have conceived it possible that blank verse, by any process of debasement, could have been reduced to the level of the personages who figure in this drama. Even George Barnwell is dismissed to the gallows in prose,—and he was certainly better connected in life, and better entitled to a lofty vocabulary, than any of the characters that move through the agitated scenes of “The Daughter.” But we suppose the apology is to be found in Fielding—

“Love levels ranks, lords down to cellars bears,  
And bids the brawny porter climb up stairs.”

And so through the whole range of the passions—the occasion, and not the individual propriety, determining the elevation of the style. Did we not believe that the incongruity of assigning to the lowest classes in society the same poised and deliberate form of language that is held by the highest persons of the drama, lay upon the surface, and was visible to ordinary observation at first sight, we might feel it necessary to shew that Mr. Sheridan Knowles has committed a fundamental error in the adaptation of such dialogue to such characters. But the absurdity carries its own condemnation.

The scene of this play is laid on the coast of Cornwall. The *personæ* are wreckers, who live by stripping the dead, and plundering the hulks of vessels drifted to the shore. It opens with a group of these desperate men, who, in the usual way, defend their calling by such arguments as expediency brings to their aid, but protest against the crime of murder, which, it appears, they suspect one of their associates, Black Norris, of hav-

ing committed at a particular reef, over which he claims an undivided right. This prepares the reader at once for an unfavourable impression of Norris, whose rugged professions of bold honesty do not quite clear him from suspicion. The next scene introduces the lovers—the only lovers—of the drama: Edward, the son of a wrecker, but who has eschewed the villanous occupation, and taken to the sea, and Marian, the daughter of another wrecker, but whose gentleness and truth chide her father's spirit in his degrading pursuits. Edward is about to make his last voyage, and they are to be married on his return, and to live upon the hoarded savings of his toil.

“EDW. Look blythe, my pretty Marian! The true heart  
Should ne'er be a misgiving one!—My girl,  
My gentle girl, look blythe! Didst ever see  
So fair a day?—There's scarce a cloud in sight!  
The breeze is just the one our vessel likes;  
Jibb, spanker, all will draw! Tight-water boat,  
Staunch crew, bold captain,—Marian, what's to fear?

MAR. Absence, that gives to lovers taste of death!  
And long protracted makes them wish for death!  
So wearisome to bear! When last you left,  
So long you stay'd,—life, from a precious gift  
Became a load methought I could lay down,  
Nor deem it loss, but gain!—my constant thought,  
How time did break his promise, day by day,  
To bring thee back to me. O! of the sighs  
I have heaved in an hour I could have found a wind,  
Had I the cunning to make store of them,  
Would cause thy ship to heel! There have I sat,  
From coming in to going out of light,  
Perch'd, like a lonely beacon, on the cliff,  
Watching for thee;—and if I saw a speck,  
I thought thee there—and when it pass'd away,  
I felt the pangs of parting o'er again!  
How long wilt be away?

EDW. A month.

MAR. Say two!

I'll make my mind up to two months—and then,  
If thou return'st before the time, thou know'st  
It will be usury of happiness!  
Thou shalt stay two months!—Two months is a long time!

EDW. I tell thee but a month!

MAR. I'll not believe it;  
For, if I should, and thou beyond should'st stay,  
Each hour beyond will be another month:  
So, for my two months, may I pine two score!  
Nay, for two months I will not look for thee!”

This pretty play of the affections is truthful, even if it be somewhat affected. This caution of the heart, expressing alike its fears and its safeguards, is natural; but Marian prattles on, and betrays her woman's weakness in the end. She confesses that she fears the presence of Black Norris, and relates how once, when Edward was at sea, she sat at night with his mother, who described to her a story of a wrecker, who, discovering the body of a man, in which life was not yet extinct, washed ashore, destroyed the life that the tempest had spared, and immediately after, as the lightning glared upon him, recognized in his victim the features of his own son, who had been banished. This story deeply affected her imagination at the time, and she could not help connecting it vaguely with the horror inspired by Black Norris, whose father was under sentence of transportation for a murder he had committed on the coast. The effect of the story was a dream, in which she fancied that she saw Black Norris standing on a reef, a vessel strike upon the rocks, and a body, still alive, cast upon the shore. The sequel of this fantasy was the murder of the stranger by Black Norris, who had no sooner committed the act, than he discovered that he was a parricide. This narrative, however tedious in the relation, is necessary to the development of the subsequent scenes. It is upon this revelation, in fact, that the whole plot turns.

We have next the interior of the cottage of Robert, Marian's father. He is occupied in splicing an oar, preparatory to the expected wrecks of a stormy night. The intervals are filled up, somewhat out of place, in a dialogue with a boy, in which he describes the goodness of his wife, who endeavoured in vain to reclaim him from his evil habits, and to whose virtuous example the excellent dispositions of Marian are to be attributed. The conversation is interrupted by the appearance of Marian, who, perceiving how he is employed, tries to prevail upon him to abandon his calling. There is great eloquence and beauty in her appeals to his better nature:—

“MAR. How canst thou bear  
To strip the seaman, whom the winds do strip—  
The waves—the rocks—which know not what they do;  
But thou dost know, and ought'st to feel! To live  
Upon the plunder of the elements!  
The havock of whose fury it should be  
Thy labour to repair! The drowning man  
Forgot, to get possession of the mite  
For which he bides the perils of the sea!  
And, if he sinks, is not his bubbling breath—  
That calls upon the friends he leaves behind—

A testament, more strong than pen can write,  
To make assurance unto those he loves  
Of aught the billows spare? Thy boat-hook drops—  
Give my thy axe.

STEPHEN. The storm is on! It thunders!

MARIAN. It is the voice of Heaven in anger!—calls  
On men for pity to each other—each  
Alike in peril plac'd—Let go thy axe!  
Think of the axe that's lifted now above  
And falling fast!—might it not light on thee?  
Let go thy axe!—O the poor ship—poor crew!  
That hear the thunder which the ship hears not!  
O their poor wives! poor children! and poor friends;  
That pray this hour some help may be at hand!  
Hear me, my father! Have not you a child?  
Were you at sea!—were you within that ship!  
Give me your axe—and now that coil of rope—  
Your grapple—give it me! .

STEPHEN. A gun!

ROB. It is.

The signal of distress.

MAR. Thy grapple, father!

ROB. I tell thee, Marian, not a soul can live  
In such a sea as boils within our bay.

MAR. And shouldst thou therefore strip the drowned man?  
O! at his death-bed, by the side of which  
No friend doth stand, there is a solitude  
Which makes the grave itself society!—  
Helplessness, in comparison with which  
An ordinary death is kin to life!—  
And silence, which the bosom could fill up  
With thoughts more aching, sad, and desolate  
Than ever uttered wailing tongues of friends  
Collected round the bier of one beloved!—  
To rifle him!—purloin his little stock  
Of gold, or jewels, or apparel!—take  
And use it as thine own!—thou!—thou! whom Heaven  
Permits to see the sun that sets to him;  
And treasures ten times dearer than the sun  
Which he shall never see!—O touch it not!  
Or if thou touch it—drop it, and fall down  
Upon thy knees, at thought of what he was,  
And thou, through grace, art still!

ROB. Her mother's voice!

Her mother's words!—Here take the coil!—Put by  
My boat-hook and my axe!—My Marian,  
I'll not go to the beach!"

resist the signal gun of distress, and, in despite of his daughter's prayers, he rushes out to his unholy work. This ends the first act.

In the second act, we learn that Black Norris secretly loves Marian, and that he is resolved to stop at no measures to obtain her. The opportunity is at hand. He encounters Robert on his way to the shore, and giving him information that the vessel has struck, directs him to the point where his harvest is to be made. A body has been washed ashore, and the object of Black Norris is to commit Robert, by the force of appearances, to the charge of murder. This is the hinge of the tragic interest of the piece. Robert is seen dragging in a body, and Marian in the distance coming down a cliff. In the conversation that follows, she works upon his conscience, and he resolves to return home. But he has forgotten his boat-hook (for the convenience of the *situation*), and goes off to fetch it, leaving her for a moment alone. Here is one of the stage effects in which our modern play-wrights outrage all probability to bring about their purpose:—

“ROB. I'll follow thee.  
I'll fetch my boat-hook, and my other geer,  
And follow thee. [Exit.

MAR. I'll loiter till you come. (*Goes slowly out.*)  
(*Enter NORRIS, cautiously.*)

NOR. Now is the time!—Now! while her back's to me.  
Is he dead? There's warmth methinks about the heart,  
More than there should be! 'Tis no matter!—Cowards  
May stick at trifles!—Can I find a stone,  
To knock him on the head?—What's this?—a knife!  
'Tis Robert's!

MARIAN (*re-appearing, and ascending the cliff.*)  
What's that you are doing, father?

NOR. She takes me for her father!—Good! She'll see  
What I'll do, and think it is her father does it.  
And when 'tis done, so will I slink away,  
She can't discover her mistake!—Now for it!

(*He plunges the knife into the body—MARIAN utters  
a faint shriek, and falls senseless.*)

She saw it! She is in my power! She's mine!  
I'll hence and watch my time. [Exit.

ROBERT (*re-entering*).

To leave it there!  
And the last time! There's treasure—I did feel it  
Hard, hard and bulky! Marian is away;  
(*Goes to the body, and empties one pocket.*)  
What have we here? Some of the bright broad pieces  
Black Norris showed me! What a folly 'twere

To leave them in the pockets of the dead,  
And let the living go with empty ones !  
I'll count them by and by !—and this is full !

*(Empties the other pocket.)*

I'll ease it of its burthen !—Gold ! All gold !  
Whence comes that glare ? Ha !—"Tis the beacon struck  
By the lightning, and on fire !"

At this moment a group of wreckers, to whom Black Norris has given information, appear; Robert is discovered rifling the body, pierced by *his own knife*, and the honest fraternity, shocked at the iniquity of the act, take him into custody. The whole of this is beneath contempt. The number of improbabilities that are necessary to conduct the circumstances to this issue, could be tolerated only in some extravagant melodrama, wherein the audience are willing to endure any nonsense that conducts to some exciting sequel. It is necessary, first, that Robert should drop his knife close to the body; that Marian, who had been in search of him, should come upon him *just* at that moment; that she should, then and there, with the wealth he had coveted absolutely within his grasp, prevail upon him to forego his purpose, which she had failed to do when the temptation was not near at hand, and therefore not so tempting; that he should have forgotten his boat-hook somewhere else, to give him an excuse for going off the stage that Norris might occupy it; that Marian herself should immediately after leave the stage, that Norris might explain his purpose to the audience in a soliloquy; that she should return again in a few minutes, for no other reason in the world than to witness the act of assassination, and, above all, and to crown all, that she should mistake Black Norris for her father. All these small details, each of which is unlikely, but the whole of which is absurdly improbable, are requisite to effect the proposed end—the implication of murder against her father, she being the only witness of the fact.

The worthy wreckers, who have suddenly been converted into avengers of the violated laws, confine Robert in a hut, until they have procured a more legitimate warrant for his detention. Here he is visited by Norris, who, scaring him by a terrible picture of an ignominious death, urges him to fly, and supplies him with gold to effect his escape, promising, as soon as he is safe, to send Marian after him. Robert, after giving way to some scruples, takes his advice, and leaves the hut. Norris is now joined by Wolf, a comrade and creature of his own, to whom, with a recklessness that is perfectly preposterous, he communicates the fact of Robert's innocence, and his own guilt. This is not done in the way of confession, or of close confidence, but



purely as a mockery of the weakness exhibited by Wolf, who has just returned from seeing the dead body. Wolf enters into a particular description of the state of the body, informing Norris that it was not quite dead. The reader is hardly prepared for the disclosure that follows:—

“NOR. Any more?

WOLF. Yes; fainter though at every time;  
And now the heart beat faint, and presently  
Came a slight shivering o'er the body—then  
A sigh—and nothing more—the soul had fled!

NOR. I thought 'twas over warm about the heart!

WOLF. O Norris, say it not!

NOR. What did I say?

WOLF. You thought 'twas over warm about the heart.

NOR. Well!—Of what value is a spark of life,  
More than a spark of any other thing?

WOLF. The body was thy father's!

NOR. Devil!—Imp

Of Hell! Unsay it, or thou diest, with

A lie in thy throat!

WOLF. Were it my last breath, Norris,  
I speak the truth!”

Upon this, the whole anxiety of Norris is lest the body should be recognised when “it is brought before the coroner!”

“WOLF. I have taken care of that.

NOR. Mangled the features?

WOLF. Yes!

NOR. Savage!—

WOLF. For thy sake I did it!

NOR. True!

Right!—You did very right—and after all  
What was it but a piece of clay?”

The next thing to be done is to get Wolf out of the way, and Norris, promising to take care of him, calls him his “true friend,” and so they separate. We are now introduced to the desolate cottage of Robert, with Marian, mourning, like her namesake of old, in her bereaved homestead. The danger of using domestic images too freely is aptly illustrated in her soliloquy. Speaking of her own natural timidity, and the dreadful trials to which she is now exposed, she apostrophises after this fashion:—

“Me, that when household use required the life  
Of a poor brainless bird, would run a mile  
To get some other hand to take it, nor  
Nor could even then look on!”

Which means, literally, that she possessed so much sensibility that

she could not wring the neck of a chicken for dinner. This delicacy in a wrecker's daughter, judging from wreckers' daughters in general, is somewhat ridiculous; but it only shows to what straits a natural poet is driven, when, having taken up an unmanageable subject, he endeavours to accommodate his own fine perceptions of truth to its insurmountable difficulties. While Marian is in this abstraction, Robert, resolved to see her before he goes, enters. Her manner betrays her conviction of his guilt; and he, conscious of his innocence, resolves to remain where he is. Throughout the whole play, Robert exhibits a very remarkable spirit of indecision—making promises at one moment which he is almost sure to break in the next. The result is that he is taken, brought to trial, and found guilty upon the evidence of his daughter. The scene that ensues is the finest in the play. After the trial he encounters his daughter. We can afford space only for a part of this meeting.

“ MAR. My father !

ROB. Up ! or I will trample on thee !  
Fasten my hands in thy dark silken hair,  
And lift thee up by it, and fling thee from me !—  
Who gave thee those fine locks ?

MAR. Thou ! Thou !

ROB. Who gave thee  
Those hands thou clasp'st to me ?

MAR. Thou !

ROB. I !—Indeed !  
And the rest of thy limbs ?—thy body ? and the tongue  
Thou speak'st with—Owest thou every thing to me ?

MAR. I do !—Indeed I do !

ROB. Indeed ! Indeed !  
Thou liest ! Thou wert never child of mine !  
No !—No !—I never carried thee up and down  
The beach in my arms, many and many a day,  
To strengthen thee, when thou wast sickly !—No !  
I never brought thee from the market town,  
Whene'er I went to it, a pocket load  
Of children's gear !—No !—No, I never was  
Your play-fellow that ne'er fell out with you  
Whate'er you did to him !—No !—Never ! Nor  
When fever came into the village, and  
Fix'd its fell gripe upon you, I never watch'd  
Ten days and nights running, beside your bed,  
Living I know not how, for sleep I took not,  
And hardly food ! And since your mother died—

MAR. Thou'lt kill me, father !

ROB. Since your mother died  
I have not been a mother and a father

Both—both to thee !

MAR. Oh !—spare me !

ROB. I was never

Anything to thee !—Call me father !—why

A father's life is wrapp'd up in his child !

Was mine wrapp'd up in thee ?—Thou know'st 'twas not !—

How durst thou call me father ?—fasten upon me !—

That never gave thee proof, sign, anything

Of recognition that thou wast my child !

Strain'd thee to my heart by the hour !—parting thy hair

And smoothing it, and calling thee all things

That fondness idolizing thinks upon

To speak its yearning love !—core of my heart !

Drop of my heart's blood, was worth all the rest !

Apple of mine eye, for which I'd give mine eyes,

Orbs, sockets, lids and all !—'till words grew sobs,

And love, o'er fraught, put what it lov'd away

To get relief from tears !—Never did I

Do this to thee !—why call me father, then,

Thou art no child of mine ?

MAR. I am thy child !

The child to whom thou did'st all this and more.

ROB. Thou stood'st not then, just now, in the witness box,

Before the justice in that justice room,

And swor'st my life away.

MARIAN. Where thou dost say,

I stood !—What thou dost say, I did !—and yet,

Not in those hours thou nam'st of fond endearment,

Felt, as I felt it then, thou wast my father !

ROB. Well !—Justify it—prove thee in the right—

Make it a lawful thing—a natural thing—

The act of a child !—a good child !—a true child !

An only one !—one parent in the grave,

The other left—that other, a fond father—

A fond, old, doting, idolising father !

Approve it such an act in such a child

To slay that father ! Come !

MAR. An oath !—an oath !

ROB. Thy father's life !

MAR. Thy daughter's soul !

ROB. 'Twere well

Thy lip had then a little of the thing

The heart had over much of !

MAR. What ?

ROB. Stone !—Rock !

They never should have opened !

MAR. Silence had

Condemned thee equally.

ROB. But not the breath

Mine own life gave !

MAR. I felt in the justice-room  
As if the final judgment-day were come,  
And not a hiding-place my heart could find  
To screen a thought or wish ; but every one  
Stood naked 'fore the judge, as now my face  
Stands before you ! All things did vanish, father !  
That make the interest and the substance up  
Of human life—which, from the mighty thing  
That once was all in all, was shrunk to nothing,  
As by some high command my soul received,  
And could not but obey, it did cast off  
All earthly ties, which, with their causes, melted  
Away ! And I saw nothing but the Eye  
That seeth all, bent searchingly on mine,  
And my lips oped as not of their own will  
But of a stronger—I saw nothing then  
But that all-seeing Eye---but now I see  
Nothing but my Father !

*(She rushes towards him, and throws  
her arms round his neck.)*"

Intelligence now arrives that Edward has been drowned, and Marian, lingering round the walls of the prison, receives it almost joyfully, glad that her lover has escaped the infliction of her father's disgrace. The scene with the jailor, entreating admission to her father, which she is denied, is natural and affecting. But now comes the catastrophe. Norris appears, and in the midst of her misery asks her to marry him, undertaking at the same time, as the condition, that he will prove her father's innocence, and procure his release. The facilities of dramatists in legal matters is curious. Norris effects this object without criminating himself; and a case of evidence is established such as, we may venture to assert, is not to be found in the books. Robert, however, is free, which is all that is required, and Marian prepares to fulfil her pledge. At this juncture Edward returns, his death being merely a contrivance to enhance the troubles of the scene. Portions of this interview are natural, and, on the stage, would, no doubt, be effective. She shrinks from him at first, and he is about to seek elsewhere the cause of her avoidance, when she recalls him.

"MAR. Stop ! Come back !—

No !—Stay !—Forgive me, Edward ! *(falling on her knees.)*

EDW. Marian !

Forgive thee ! Why ? For what ?

MAR. Don't ask ! To sea !

On shipboard, and set sail, whate'er the wind,—

Anything, Edward, but the shore! To sea!  
 Rocks, breakers, sands, are nothing!—all the perils  
 Of leaks, dismasting, canvass blown to threads,  
 Are nothing! Foundering!—the dismal plight,  
 That ever bark was in, are nothing! Yea,  
 Drowning, with thoughts of going deeper down  
 Than ever plummet sounded, or of graves  
 Made of the throats of sea monsters, that dog  
 The fated vessel! Leap into them sooner  
 Thou trust thy feet on land! To sea! To sea!

EDW. What mean you?

MAR. I will tell you while I can!

EDW. Rise up, then, and don't kneel to me!

MAR. Forgive me!

EDW. For what?

MAR. Ay that's the thing, you can't forgive me  
 Until you know for what, and when you know it,  
 Will you forgive me then? You will not! Yet  
 Were it my last breath that I speak with to thee,  
 I love thee dear as ever!—dearer!—  
 I love thee dearer than I ever did!"

It is too late to retreat, and the bridal party proceed to the church. When they arrive there, Robert remonstrates with Norris, who is determined upon the fulfilment of the contract. Marian, who seems to possess a sort of second sight, relapses into a fit of inspiration, and relates the events of an imaginary revelation, or dream, in which, as before, she describes a wreck, and a body, and Norris committing the act of murder—upon his own father. Presently Wolf makes his appearance, and is appropriately stabbed by Black Norris, who, being carried off to condign punishment, the reader is left to believe in the divine retribution of poetical justice.

The space which our account of this play has occupied affords a proof of the wearisomeness of its incidents, and of the want of singleness and wholeness—if we may use the expression—in its construction. Except in isolated parts, where there are gleams of natural feeling, which would have been still more natural had the speakers been chosen from a less deplorable caste, there is nothing in it to identify it with the genius of Sheridan Knowles. It is thoroughly unworthy of his reputation, and still more unworthy of his powers. The frequent repetitions of the dream—not merely in relation, but in actual performance—the reliance upon the superstition and credulity of the audience—the general character of the incidents, and the ridiculous way in which they are brought about—and the palpable inconsistencies that are committed in order to produce certain effects, must for ever

exclude the play from that place in the estimation of discerning readers, to which the rest of Mr. Knowles's productions are justly entitled. We have the less hesitation in pronouncing this opinion freely, as none amongst those who have upon all occasions expressed a cordial admiration of his genius, have contributed more effectually to urge it into exertion than ourselves. He is the only dramatist of the day who can afford to be condemned unreservedly; and he will the more estimate our applause of that which is solid and permanent, when he finds that we unhesitatingly censure that which is meretricious and evanescent.

Some of the Florentine historians relate variously, but none of them clearly, a tragical event that took place in the family of Cosmo, Grand Duke of Tuscany, according to which one of the duke's sons killed his elder brother in the heat of a sudden quarrel. So far as the particulars are warranted—although not verified—by history, the facts appear to be these:—the two princes went out to hunt; in the course of the sport they happened to lose their companions, and, coming into a lonely part of the forest together, a foolish quarrel arose between them, when, both drawing at the same moment, the elder brother received his death wound. In his defence, the survivor stated that his brother had struck the first blow; but however that may be, Cosmo, with the assumption of a Roman sternness, which in that age of the world reflects indelible disgrace upon his memory, is said to have put the youth to death with his own hand—stabbing him, according to one account, in the arms of his mother, who soon followed her boy to the grave. It was given out at the time that both the princes died of the plague, and the servile court historians of the day, fearful, no doubt, of incurring the displeasure of the despotic duke, did not hesitate to adopt that version of the event which was most likely to obtain the favour of their master. Upon this story, which is loose enough to afford ample room to the invention of the dramatist, Mr. Horne has founded his tragedy of *Cosmo de' Medici*.

The character of Cosmo is described by different historians agreeably to the influences under which they wrote, and Mr. Horne is certainly so far justified in choosing for himself whether he should consider that monarch as a man of "commanding intellect and natural nobility," or as an ambitious, subtle, and cruel despot. He has authorities in his favour either way. But we cannot consent to admit the propriety of the following canon laid down by Mr. Horne in his preface.

"The private character of the historian and of the dramatist, and the circumstances of their lives, influence but too often their account of men and things, to the great injury of a just general estimate of those

who have held high places in the world's regard. There is, however, a considerable difference in their respective moralities, when such instances occur. The dramatist claims the right of throwing the strongest colours upon certain elevations, and of lowering other grounds—whether disputed or admitted—into the deep shades of terror or desolation: the historian assumes to walk in a level altitude, above all inventions, prejudices, passions, and one-sided views and inferences, portraying nothing but well attested facts, with their co-relative deductions. But the historian, only, being considered as the practical authority, erroneous opinions are thus generated and circulated from age to age.”—Preface, p. 5.

The private character of the historian and the dramatist, and the circumstances of their lives, undoubtedly too often influence their account of men and things; but there is nothing peculiar in that fact. It applies equally to the humble biographer, and to the essayist, and, indeed, to all classes and descriptions of writers, who are all, more or less, influenced by their private characters, and the circumstances of their lives. But what Mr. Horne—if we have read the whole passage correctly—means is this, that the dramatist has a right to colour subjects—whether admitted or disputed—in the way that will be most likely to subserve his own ends. We beg to dissent totally from Mr. Horne. The dramatist possesses no such right. He is not more entitled to deal with history capriciously than the historian; and, indeed, if we look to the great extent of the means at his disposal, for making general impressions upon the great bulk of the people, who rarely consult history with advantage, he is subject to a much more serious responsibility than the historian, who, if he mis-state, exaggerate, or suppress, is at once amenable to correction. But no such criticism awaits the dramatist in the exercise of his vocation upon the stage: the characters he draws are received, and obtain credence in quarters where the historical correction never penetrates. In this way, Shakspeare has done more to vitiate history than, perhaps, any other writer that has ever lived: and we do not say more than we really believe to be true, when we assert that the great mass of the indolent and uneducated in this country have derived whatever fragmentary knowledge of English history they possess, from the representation of Shakspeare's historical plays, which, we need not add, are very dangerous authorities in such matters.

It is necessary to say so much upon the general principle, preliminary to the protest which we cannot avoid entering against Mr. Horne's view of the character of Cosmo de' Medici. We should be glad to have heard his defence of that view, which he says he reserves for a second edition, when judgment shall have been pronounced upon the tragedy itself. But almost the

first question that arises is concerning this very point, without reference to which it is impossible to pronounce a judgment upon the tragedy. Setting aside the authority of Sismondi, whose condemnation of Cosmo must go a great way to determine any doubts upon the subject, the plain facts of his life establish, we think undeniably, the fallacy Mr. Horne has fallen upon in investing him with a high and philosophic temperament. The government of Florence, previous to the reign of Cosmo, was, in its essence, a republic. Like all republics, it was gradually absorbed into the hands of a few. Corruption had crept into high places, and the Medici family were its mighty agents. But still the *name* of the republic was preserved in all its transactions, and the reigning Duke or Doge possessed only so much arbitrary power as his own abilities and personal weight enabled him to concentrate in himself. Upon the death of Alessandro, who was assassinated, Cosmo was elected against the will of the republican party; the Senate, whom no historian will affect to consider a pure and disinterested body, excluding the lineal heir on the ground that he had compassed the death of the last duke. Cosmo, therefore, was elected by force; and, be it observed, that, unlike a popular election in which the legitimate heir is set aside by the will of the people, in this instance the legitimate heir was set aside against the will of the people. To all intents and purposes, therefore, Cosmo ascended the Florentine throne by usurpation. But we must look a little beyond that fact for the character of Cosmo. He had no sooner secured the ducal power, than he set about enlarging its domains, and in a little time he acquired possession of a number of petty Italian states, which he, at last, united into one sovereignty, under the title of Grand Dukedom of Tuscany. The nature of his policy could not be mistaken: it was aggressive, grasping, and tyrannical. The Florentine republic perished under his sway, and upon its ruins he erected a powerful and unlimited monarchy, which he lived to delegate to his son, when his own excesses had enfeebled and prostrated him. These are matters of historical record. They cannot be softened in the relation, and his numerous acts of personal despotism cannot be defended even by the argument of expediency. That he was a man of vigour, and of considerable ability, must be admitted; but he had an unscrupulous conscience—he was heartless, self-willed, and oppressive. To embellish such a man with noble qualities of mind is surely carrying the license which Mr. Horne claims a little too far.

But even granting, for a moment, the historical truth of the portrait drawn by Mr. Horne, the character in the tragedy is inconsistent with itself. If Cosmo were the individual depicted



by the dramatist, it is utterly impossible that he could have committed the act which forms the catastrophe of this play. We are not now discussing the authenticity of the statements upon which the act itself may be proved or disputed, but the internal likelihood and keeping of the character as it is here described. Cosmo lived in a Christian age; his dignities were imposed by the hands of the Pope himself; the dark creed of ancient Rome had faded in the light of a benignant revelation; the responsibilities of the Christian as well as the sovereign were upon the head of the angered father;—is it reasonable to suppose that a philosopher, a Christian philosopher, a man of the highest order of intellect, the patron of letters, the dispenser of honors, the idolized of poets and historians, would have thus deliberately—not in passion, or in the frenzy of sudden impulse—made a sacrifice that has no parallel except in the annals of heathen antiquity? To ascribe the act to Cosmo is in itself an assumption that he was not the man Mr. Horne portrays him; but having so chosen to portray him, Mr. Horne ought to have exercised his dramatic discretion over that revolting incident, and accomplished the catastrophe by some other means. Either way, Mr. Horne is in a dilemma.

This is the grand fault of the tragedy; but, making the necessary allowance for the defects of treatment it rendered unavoidable, the play is written in a fine vein of poetical feeling, and contains many scenes of deep and intense power. The strife of the brothers, from which the main interest of the play arises, and upon which a tragedy was founded by Alfieri, is not, perhaps, sufficiently thrown out, nor does the author exhibit much skill in making the contradictions in their character the spring of jealousy in the first instance, instead of their mutual passion for Ippolita, which they do not discover until they are at the height of their quarrel. Nor is the difference in their character sufficiently striking to produce the intended impression upon the audience, who would find some difficulty in deciding which of them was entitled to the larger share of sympathy, the prince who is killed, or the survivor. The tone of this portion of the tragedy will be seen in the following speech of Garcia, who, wandering upon the outskirts of the forest after he had killed his brother, breaks out into this despairing soliloquy:—

“GAR. Thro’ the wild silence of this savage forest  
 I’ve wander’d with quick steps to shun the scene.  
 I’m on the outskirts now—where would I go?  
 Where’er I turn, Giovanni’s dying form  
 Lies in my path—and in my tingling ears  
 Giovanni’s dying words are still repeated !

Where would I fly—unless into the grave?  
 But wherefore?—for I know not how 'twas done.  
 He struck me—lung'd at me—we fought—he fell—  
 How was't he got his death-wound? Oh vain thought!  
 What can restore him—what can bring him back?  
 Nothing!—for he is dead—I left him dead—  
 And I must answer for it! Answer!—how?  
 What can I answer—save that we did fight,  
 And he is slain? There is no other answer.  
 But can I say this to my father?—no!  
 It is impossible!—or to his mother?  
 It is impossible!—Oh 'twould increase  
 Their agonies—dragg'd with a dripping harrow  
 Through and beyond the natural gates of death—  
 To know his brother slēw him! I am resolv'd!  
 They shall *not* know it: I myself will bear  
 All the sharp torment, weighing down life's balance  
 With inward molten lead; and let my soul,  
 That in calm virtue's ether should be pois'd,  
 Sink all alone to premature dark hell—  
 But show no shadow of't in words or looks."—pp. 43-44.

Garcia denies all knowledge of the cause of his brother's absence from the court, and is harassed by questions that almost amount to a suspicion of his guilt. In the meanwhile, information has reached Cosmo that his son's body has been found in the forest, and he orders it to be secretly brought to the palace, with the intention of suddenly revealing it to Garcia, as a test of the crime which he refuses to confess. Into this scene the author throws all his powers.

"COSMO. The solid earth beneath me seems to rock;  
 Yet will not I!—like Justice, will I stand!  
 Upon mine own foundation—steel'd in right!  
 And thou—O, vast marmoreal arch above!  
 Whereon the luminous host in silence range;  
 Glorified giants and portentous powers,  
 Coeval, coeternal with the spheres—  
 Who gaze with solar face on this my deed;  
 O, spanning arch! yawn thou, and let heaven down,  
 To crush me ere I do't, if I be wrong!

*Enter GARCIA.*

GAR. (*after a pause.*) Sir, I am here.

COSMO (*advancing close, and fixing his eyes upon him.*)  
 Art worthy to be here?

Shouldst thou not rather be within thy tomb?

GAR. I rather would be there.

COSMO. Wherefore wouldst rather?

GAR. Because, sir, I am sick of this vile life  
Which I am made to lead by constant questions  
Touching my brother's absence. Wheresoe'er  
I turn, suspicions fang me ; words are fangs,  
And looks are words—therefore I'm sick of life.

COSMO. Thou dost anticipate me, and thy craft  
Equals thy fix'd audacity.

GAR. What craft ?

COSMO. Come, let's be brief : you know Giovanni's murdered !

GAR. Murder'd, my lord !—impossible !

COSMO. *Thou did'st it !*

Thou art the murderer !

GAR. What hideous liar

Hath blown this monstrous seed in your quick ear ?

COSMO. Thou hast a demon's tongue, oh, iron-faced boy,  
That should be rooted from its upas hold,  
And cast to hungry imps ! I know thou didst it !

GAR. Then may your Highness listen to these facts :  
Cornelio and Dalmasso are both murderers—  
And all the rest that follow'd to your wars !

My mother is a murderess, in that she  
Hath wish'd success to wars her kin have wag'd !

Then, there's Ippolita—a murderess too ;  
Self-sacrificed, and in a convent buried !  
And those who ne'er have done a deed of death,

Have oft in private thought imagined it  
From causes trivial that have stirred their passions :  
Even the child who strikes intends to kill !

Thus, all the world——

COSMO. Boy ! boy ! no more !—thou utterest  
Words, the base coin of self-deceptive fiends.

I have a picture of ancient date,  
Which looks eternal—placed beyond time's hand.

*[Leading him towards the curtain.]*

It was thy mother's gift when first we married,  
And hath been treasur'd since most sacredly.

A solemn lesson doth the subject teach

To erring mortals : recognize—acknowledge !

*[He throws aside the curtain, and discovers the form of GIOVANNI laid upon a marble slab. GARCIA utters no cry ; but rushes down to the front, followed by COSMO, who points to his face.]*

GAR. *(after a pause of horror.)* I did it !

COSMO. Oh unnatural government,  
That in a mental den lock'd up such deed !  
How doth it force itself thro' the cold pores  
Of that metallic mask, and curdle there !  
Garcia ! thy soul is lost !

GAR. (*abstractedly.*) It is the form  
Of my unburied brother!—peaceful heaven  
Cherish his soul, and let it plead my cause!”—pp. 98-100.

Garcia attempts to satisfy his father that Giovanni fell in a struggle with him; but in vain. Cosmo's resolution is taken. The portions of the following speeches that are placed in inverted commas are rendered from Thuanus:—

“COSMO. Garcia! Garcia!  
It is enough.—‘Behold thy brother's blood!  
It cries aloud for vengeance on thy head,  
Waiting heaven's mandate, ministered by me!  
Oh, wretched father of a fratricide—  
Whom by all laws of justice I am bound  
To render up to Death's capacious hand—  
How wretched is surviving! But dream not  
That as an impious and unequal judge  
My people shall impugn him. It is better  
That future times should call me barbarous  
In this my private act, than as a sovereign  
Weak and unjust. Therefore prepare to die!’

GAR. Under what awful impulse dost thou act?

COSMO (*pointing upwards.*) Under authority!

GAR. Life's worthless to me—but to end it thus—  
You do deceive yourself—yet hear me, father!  
Show me the proof of this high mission?

COSMO. There!—  
I am the father of that corpse!

GAR. (*clasping his hands.*) I know it, sir; and I—I am its  
brother!

COSMO. Dar'st thou so call thyself, who art—his murderer?

GAR. I am no such wretch—and yet a wretch who cares not  
How soon he die!

COSMO. That moment now is come!

[*He draws forth GARCIA'S broken sword.*]

GAR. Horrible death! by these cold, pausing steps—  
Silent as heaven before the earth was made—  
Yet thundering in the brain as they advance,  
Like slow, but final judgment! Do not kill me!

COSMO. Not final—save on earth.

GAR. You will not kill me!

You cannot mean it!—I have done no wrong.

COSMO. How! with yon weltering witness?

GAR. Heaven take me home!

I see it—see nothing else.—Well, well, all's o'er—

I care not, sir! I steadily tell you that!

Brother, I pardon thee! 'twas thy good chance

To die, and not to suffer as I have done:

We shall be reconciled within the tomb!

COSMO. Look up, ye fiends !—behold this broken blade !  
Doth not the fragment pierce thine inmost sense  
With this last proof ?

GAR. I have nought more to say.

COSMO. ‘Unnatural boy, ’tis fit thy course should cease,  
Lest all thy family thou shouldst cut off,  
Or blank their prospects and eclipse their fame ;’  
Choking their sun with blood, and causing tears  
To fall where clarion’d glories should arise !  
Leagued with fell bandits and with pirate hordes,  
Perchance e’en now they hover round our gates  
With bosom-heated steel.

GAR. God is my judge !

COSMO. In heaven ;—but first on earth it is ordain’d  
There should be judges to arraign men’s deeds,  
And send the guilty hence to the Court Supreme !  
Farewell, O, wretched son !—I cannot give  
A father’s blessing—yet—my son—farewell !

[GARCIA kneels, and COSMO embraces, and hangs fondly  
over him : then lifts himself up, and raises the sword  
towards heaven.]

‘Thou constant God ! sanction, impel, direct  
The sword of Justice !—and for a criminal son  
That pardon grant which his most wretched father  
Thurs in the hour of agony implores !’

[The scene closes ; the tableau of the figures previously representing a partial resemblance to statuary, or a monumental design, in the position, the pallid look, and the immobility of the group, together with the form and colour of the dresses and draperies. The scene should be addressed to the imagination and the passions, rather than to the eye.]—pp. 101-103.

We need not follow the tragedy to its conclusion in the death of Cosmo, which is wild and grand, and involves an excusable anachronism. From the passages we have quoted, the character of the tragedy may be inferred. The style is generally lofty, sometimes inflated ; and, on the whole, it appears to be well adapted for the purpose of representation, although we cannot venture to anticipate the reception which the audience would give to the terrible act of retribution. A stirring spirit moves through all the scenes. The work is highly impassioned throughout—perhaps too much so ; but that is a quality which would only have the effect of making the spectator feel the power of the passing incidents the more vividly.

Mr. Colombine’s tragedy of “Marcus Manlius,” embraces the incidents related in Livy and Plutarch, respecting the defence of the capitol by the Consul, at the time when the Gauls were in

possession of the rest of the City of Rome, the charge subsequently brought against him for aspiring to the supreme power, and his condemnation to the Tarpeian rock—incidents with which our readers are so familiar that we are spared the necessity of going into details. Historical truth is faithfully preserved in this play, and the character of Camillus, or as much of it as is shown to us, is tolerably correct. But Manlius is irresolutely drawn: he alternately invites contempt, admiration, and pity; and at the close we are suspended between regret at his fate, and an inward acknowledgment of its justice. The only deviation Mr. Colombine makes from history, is in the introduction of Octavia, the daughter of Manlius—there being no evidence on record that Manlius had a daughter. The object of this interpolation, however, is to encrease the interest of the drama by a story of troubled wooing, Lucius, the son of Camillus, the avowed enemy of Manlius, being in love with Octavia. This passion involves some inconsistencies, such as the impossibility of either Lucius or Octavia being ignorant of the position in which their fathers stood towards each other, while it exposes the lady to the charge of superfluous perfidy, since she no sooner learns who Lucius is than she forswears her love, which she had only just consecrated by a vow of eternal truth. The chief and prevailing fault of this play is that it is overloaded with *tableaux*. Even in the closet this has the effect of reducing the tone below the ordinary level of the tragic drama, and on the stage it would risk the chance of its making any deeper impression upon the audience than that of a highly-wrought melo-drama. The scenes are too close upon each other, the action is too quick and abrupt; the characters consequently are not sufficiently developed, and that which is really forcible in the dialogue loses the power which it would possess, if it were prolonged and sustained.

This tragedy furnishes a solution of that curious problem in composition which has often been considered, and as often rejected as a mere jest. Mr. Colombine, whose blank verse is of the average quality, and is generally solid and well-knit together, cannot communicate his thoughts in prose without committing the most marvellous solecisms. His dedication and preface are written in such vile taste, that if the critic were not very patient and pains-taking, he would look no farther, taking it for granted that a gentleman who could not write better prose, could not write poetry at all. Yet his dialogue is just and natural, seldom rising into dignity, but rarely sinking into bathos or even feebleness. Take the defence of Manlius as an example. This is certainly the best scene in the play; the con-

ception is good, and the execution reaches in some parts almost to grandeur.

"CAMILLUS. How say'st thou prisoner? Answer to this charge  
So far by evidence established.

MANLIUS. Romans and fellow-countrymen! I stand  
In this tribunal, as ne'er stood man before,  
Without defenders, and without appeal.  
Whate'er your judgment, 'tis my final doom:  
To this your accusation I first answer—  
No charge is proved involving life or honour:  
But here I stand not to *evade* a crime,  
Or shrink alone from judgment, else I'd rest  
Secure in your acquittal.

It is not life alone that is at stake.  
Mankind's esteem, my future reputation,  
This day will be determined by your sentence;  
That gem, the brightest jewel of the soul,  
Above all price or recompence, a name  
Beyond reproof, reproach, or calumny,  
Is now at stake. Once gone 'tis past recall—  
The brightness of its splendour's soon destroyed,  
Which ne'er can be restored—the slightest breath  
Will in a moment render that begrimed and black,  
Which late was bright as beauty's fairest flower.

CAMILLUS. Record thy plea!

MANLIUS. Record my plea? Record! 'tis easy thus  
For one upon the judgment-seat to arraign  
A fallen foe. Around I turn, around  
Where'er I look, the pomp, the pride of state,  
The power of the accuser stands before me,  
To mock me with the unsubstantial show  
Of justice. The judge, whose sworn duty 'tis  
To guard the culprit, e'en in his tribunal,  
Proves he can feel hatred for his fellow  
As any other being of mortal mould.  
Bethink, Camillus, how thy breath is watched,  
How words which ~~idle~~ were, pronounced by others,  
By thee, can turn e'en innocence to crime,  
And doom a guiltless man to death itself?  
My plea is this—I am the friend of Rome,  
And not her foe! Who'll dare deny my truth?  
None! or for answer, here are my rewards  
For victories won—spoils taken from your foes  
That 'neath this arm have fallen. Your honor'd crowns,  
The recompence by noble deeds obtained—  
[Pointing to crowns and spoils which had been  
previously given him.]  
My citizens and fellow-countrymen,  
Whose lives in battle have been saved by me,

These would refute the charge of enmity,  
 Altho' perchance they may be out of date,  
 Passed from the memory of forgetful man.  
 But here are proofs, which time doth not decay,  
 And death alone destroys. Behold these scars;  
 They now are small, but once there flow'd from each  
 A stream of blood—pure patriotic blood—  
 Shed in defence of Rome. [*Tears open his dress.*]"—pp. 95-97.

He reminds the friends of his youth of the halcyon days they passed together, before their hearts were corrupted by experience of the treachery of men, and then recalls his struggle in the defence of Roman liberty.

"Behold,  
 My judges! Turn; behold that spot,  
 The Capitol, where holy temples stand!  
 In peril's hour it hath been saved for you;  
 When danger threatened you, it was your shelter,  
 And was preserved by one. Bethink ye all  
 How changed, how fallen, from the patriot then,  
 I stand before ye—but I am not here  
 To name my merits. Turn unto that spot,  
 And may the gods who witness'd my deserts,  
 Who nerved my soul with energy to save  
 You Capitol, the living monument to all  
 Of my past glory—so inspire your hearts  
 To judge me truly. Turn unto the gods,  
 And say if Manlius shall be doomed to die!"

[*A murmur of approbation is heard in the assembly.*

CAMILLUS *whispers an attendant, who goes out.*]"—pp. 98-99.

In other scenes of a different kind, but not treated so elaborately, he is equally successful. When Manlius is sentenced to death, Octavia, who had previously renounced Lucius, resolves to appeal to his compassion on behalf of her father, relying for a favourable hearing upon the unextinguished tenderness of the love she had cast away. This scene is exceedingly touching, and is well adapted for representation. It takes place in the house of Camillus.

"LUCIUS. Methought I heard the voice of her I loved  
 In times gone by—how quickly pass'd away!"

OCTAVIA, *Enters.*

OCTAVIA. Oh! Lucius—Speak, speak; dost thou know me now?  
 One who in earlier days possess'd thy love.

Alas, I come to beg, entreat, implore,—  
 Thou know'st what I would say—my feeble tongue,  
 My madden'd brain, deprive me of my speech.  
 A father's life—

LUCIUS. (*turning away.*) Octavia!



OCTAVIA. Thou hast the power.  
Camillus' son can save him if he will.

LUCIUS. Cease, cease, Octavia—this I must not hear :  
I have no means to shield thy father, if  
The laws condemn him.

OCTAVIA. If—is there then a ray  
Of hope,—but no ; it is unworthy of thee  
Thus to delude a child by idle hopes  
In such a cause as this. I am not come  
As the Octavia of our earlier days,  
For *then* I knew the soul of Lucius, warm,  
Generous, and true. Ah ! had it happened *then*,  
There had been little need to beg—entreat—  
For he had fail'd but with his life itself,  
To save my father's.

LUCIUS. Nay, speak not thus :  
I am thine own in heart.

OCTAVIA. But now I'm here  
A timid *suitor*—fearing the cold repulse  
Of *patronage*—To ask a boon, from one  
Who is far above me, in rank and power :  
To him I come, a humble suppliant,  
For my poor father's life.  
Ah ! do not turn thine ear away from me,—  
Seek no excuses. Oh ! deceive me not  
With idle sympathy, or heartless words ;  
But tell me—tell me if thou wilt not save him !

LUCIUS. It must not, cannot be. I have no power  
Over Camillus' will ; and if I had,  
Think, think, Octavia, that it is *my* father  
Who feels the wrongs of thine.—No, he must fall.

OCTAVIA. Ah ! say not thus, lest my distracted mind  
Should be o'erwhelm'd, and I should perish here.  
Oh ! oh ! (*sinking at his feet.*)

LUCIUS. Forgive me, Heaven—Yes, it must be.  
Forgive me, father !—Yes, he must be saved.

[*Rushes out.*]"—pp. 101-103.

From these specimens, and the observations we have made, the merits of this tragedy may be estimated. They are not of a high order. There is too much of the real pathos of the story, and the tragic interest of the great events it embraces, sacrificed to scenic effects ; nor can we safely predicate how far Mr. Colombine is likely to attain success in the difficult path upon which he has entered. We fear that he has not sufficient command over the springs of passion to enable him to reach the demands of tragedy.

ART. V.—1. *Great Protestant Meeting.* Franklin, Dublin.  
 2. *A Familiar Epistle to Sergeant Jackson.* Ridgway, London.

TO what peculiarity in the fortune of our country is it owing, that there has never been a man in any conspicuous rank of life, known for his hostility to the happiness and freedom of the human race, who has not been in the same degree the enemy of Ireland? The magnanimous and the wise have ever loved our land, and taken an interest in all that tends to its improvement or prosperity. But there has never been a reckless trader in politics, a hackney place-hunter, a lawyer willing to barter his conscience for promotion, or a base worshipper of Mammon in any profession, who has not hated Ireland in exact proportion to the development of his other odious qualities.

We can endure—though it is hard to be reconciled to it—the existence of such a sentiment in strangers who do not know us. It is even a subject of pride and self-gratulation, when the vile and worthless of other countries are inspired with a kind of instinctive detestation of us. For next to the esteem of the virtuous, it is the highest testimony which can be offered to our national character, that we do not attract the sympathies of those with whom any kind of fellowship would be a disgrace. The enmity of such persons may often inflict serious injuries upon us; but there is something soothing in the consciousness that we deserve it. Lord Lyndhurst, for instance, is a very powerful enemy of our country. His talents, his eloquence, his persevering and fearless energy, render him a formidable foe. He has done much to obstruct our welfare; he has succeeded but too well in wounding our peace, and blowing up the embers of civil strife and discord amongst us; yet what true Irishman is there that does not rejoice to have been signalized by his hatred? Who does not feel that his country has been raised in dignity and honour by having been pronounced “alien” to such a man?

It is not unnatural, however, in those who know nothing of Ireland, but by report, to dislike it; nor should we be at all surprised, if the sentiment were much more general in England than it really is. For when it is recollected who are the authors of those evil reports, and by whom the country is constantly villified and defamed, a suspicion at least, if not a positive contempt for its people, becomes almost excusable. The worst calumniators of Ireland are Irishmen—her bitterest revilers are those whom she has nurtured in her arms, and fed from her bosom. There has never been a foul slander propagated, derogatory to her character, or calculated to do her a prejudice in the minds of those who might otherwise be disposed to serve her, which might not be

traced to an Irishman, or to one sprung from Irish blood. In other lands, there is a sentiment which unites men of all parties and political distinctions, in defending and upholding the fair fame of their country :—

“There’s a strange something—which, without a brain,  
Fools feel, and with one, wise men can’t explain—  
Planted in man to bind him to that earth,  
In dearest ties, from whence he drew his birth.”\*

But alas ! that feeling is not Irish. At least a great number of Irishmen are strangers to it, and would blush to own it. The Duke of Wellington is not singular in disowning the soil “from whence he drew his birth ;” but has many copyists among the supporters of his politics and the admirers of his wisdom. They claim affinity to his Grace, by being “of no country.”

The English Tories have, it is true, a strong antipathy to our country, and have always been ready at a call to assist in placing the iron yoke of the oppressor about her neck. They are, however, generally speaking, above the meanness of running her down with palpable falsehoods. A few renegades amongst them, like Sir James Graham, and the *Ciceronian* Hardy, do not consider it inconsistent with their dignity—of which, surely, they are the best judges—to “filch from us our good name ;” whilst such “swaggering upsprings” as Philpotts and Copley exalt themselves into notice by the same ignoble means ; but the gentlemanly Tories leave all that dirty work to be done by those who have the heartiest good-will to it—the Irish themselves. And in every class and degree of society, from the absentee marquis to the cobbler who whistles “The Boyne Water” in his bulk, the work goes bravely on. There is no learned profession, no rank of life or department of business, in which our enemies can be at a loss to find Irishmen ready and eager to rail against their country. In the House of Lords, they will find a Londonderry, a Roden, a Fitzgerald, and—*risum teneatis*?—a Glengall. In the Commons a Jackson, a Shaw, a Bateson, and that common *delator* of every thing good and honest, who profanes the honourable name of Tennant, leading a whole cohort of traducers. On the Bench are there not Joy, Doherty, Foster ? At the Bar, Litton, Brewster, and a shoal of junior malignants ? In the Church, the haters of Ireland defy enumeration—their name is Legion. And even in the seat of learning, our only university, where Plato, Cicero, Demosthenes, and Locke,† are studied, no senti-

---

\* Churchill.

† The political works of John Locke are not read in our University. The *Treatise on Government*—the only one of them which had ever been taken into the course—was forcibly ejected by Provost Elrington, as being adverse to the servile principles which were inseparably connected with his idea of a monarchy ; and neither of his successors has had the heart to replace it.

ment of patriotism is permitted to grow up. A contempt for their country, and for all who take an interest in its welfare, is infused into the young minds of Ireland, neutralizing all those just and generous emotions which a familiarity with the ancient worthies might have inspired.

“There is something more than nature in this,” as *Hamlet* says; but philosophy is at no fault to make it out. For the cause of the defect is obvious. It is seen in the engrossing, rapacious, arrogant, dishonest, and selfish spirit, which is the natural result of a long and exclusive enjoyment of power, and of all the sweet and pleasant things which accompany its possession. A few families—few in comparison to those who were equally qualified and entitled to a share in our domestic administration—divided, for many generations, amongst themselves, their hirelings, and dependents, the whole patronage and authority of the State. They had been so long in undisturbed possession of these things, that we can scarcely blame them for at length believing they had a paramount property in them. Even the slave masters of Jamaica talked of their sacred and indefeasible rights, when the privilege of “walloping their own niggers” came to be doubted: and why should not the Irish Tories, who resemble the Sugar Lords in so many of their moral and intellectual qualities, cling to their ancient usurpation as a prescriptive inheritance?

It was not till this usurpation was attacked, and seriously endangered, that Ireland became a byword amongst any portion of her own children. As long as the pelting faction which ruled us were allowed to hold our goods in peace, there were no combined efforts made to degrade our name and nation in the eyes of the world. The eloquence and invention of legal dignitaries were not then in requisition to abuse the country which gave them bread. The venerable judges did not perform their circuits with a view to throw discredit on the character of the country. Nor did they from the Bench insinuate grave accusations against the government, and enter into a sort of controversy with the newspapers—

“Dealing replies out by the way of charge.”

The nobility, whose sons and younger brothers enjoyed all the good things which they could not grasp themselves, and the country gentlemen who administered justice, as it suited their own notions of what the law *ought to be*, felt no desire whatever to represent themselves as living amongst a race of uncouth and savage outlaws. They lived on excellent terms with the country that submitted to be plucked by them.

But from the moment that the Irish people began to acquire political knowledge, and, with it, an impatience of the bondage

in which they were held, the apprehensions of the dominant party were expressed in attacks upon their character. Their demand of a participation in the management of their own affairs, was met by an impudent and insulting declaration, that they were not fit to take any share in public concerns—that they were debased by ignorance, and disqualified by crime and disloyalty, to be entrusted in the most trivial matters. From that moment it became the earnest wish, as it was the manifest interest, of the Tories, to abuse the mind of England with regard to the real state and condition of the Irish people; and hence that horrid system of falsehood and injustice, by which every fact calculated to feed or excite a prejudice against Ireland, has been magnified and distorted by the agents, and even by some of the principal leaders of this desperate faction. With unblushing audacity are they playing this last card of their hand. The more our people show themselves advanced in civilization and knowledge, the fiercer are the attempts made to depress them in the opinion of our English friends. The more worthy they prove themselves to be placed on an equality of civil privileges with their fellow-subjects, the busier are all the engines of detraction in motion, endeavouring to stop the progress which threatens to overwhelm the wretched remnant of their usurpation.

This, then, is the philosophy of Irish Toryism. This is its object in pursuing a course so mean and derogatory in itself, and so contrary to the practice of all civilized nations. Irishmen imprint the brand of shame upon their father-land. They stand up in Parliament to misrepresent the faults and failings of their own countrymen. They make absurd demonstrations of hatred, from a tribunal which should be free from all political bias or affection;—and all this is done for the purpose of deluding the people of England into a belief, that the extension of liberal institutions, and of political equality, cannot with safety be carried across St. George's Channel. Herein we see the despairing struggle of "a miserable monopolizing minority." We view the efforts of an outcast crew, striving to regain the vessel in which they sailed so long before the wind, "taking sweet meats together," and which is rapidly gliding away beyond their grasp. Their rage, which increases as their hopes recede, is consistent with the bold and shameless character of the faction, and accounts for the extreme and almost unprecedented audacity of the charges which they are now on all hands accumulating against their country and her friends.

The Corporations are the immediate objects of their monopolizing solicitude. These are in the hands of a few hundreds of persons, none of whom can be said to be eminent above the common class of the inhabitants in wisdom or in probity. We have

no wish to speak with disrespect of the present race of Irish corporators, but it is not the slightest disparagement to them to say, that every municipality contains within its limits, persons of equal rank, far exceeding in number those who usurp all the municipal functions at present, and at least equal to them in understanding, in personal character, in property, and in every quality which the state may justly require, as a security for the fair and honest discharge of a public trust. The Municipal Reform Bill would provide for the admission of such men to a participation in the right of guarding their own interests. It proposes to open the corporations to these respectable, intelligent, and substantial townsmen. But the Tories would rather annihilate the corporations altogether, than consent to such a profanation of their monopoly. They would prefer to dash to the earth the cup out of which they have so often quaffed the red and fiery draughts of intolerance together, sooner than dilute its contents with one drop of pure justice. This is Lord Francis Egerton's plan; but the good sense of the English people has repudiated it with scornful indignation. It was too barefaced, too absurd a scheme, to meet the support of a just and enlightened people; and accordingly, it has received such a check, that we venture to predict—whatever fate shall attend the bill in its present progress through Parliament—the Tories will never muster assurance enough to broach that notable device again. They will not insult the common sense of the nation by asserting, as they have done, that because the rights of the community have been so long usurped and abused, they should now be destroyed, at one fell swoop, for ever. The majority on the second reading of the bill taught them that such juggling trickery is not to be repeated with impunity.

But they have yet another shaft in their quiver, which, as being “unbaited and envenomed,” has been committed to the hands of recreant Irishmen to send it home. This is the weapon of detraction; and thus they bring it to bear upon the Corporation Question. It is true (they admit) our towns contain many worthy and respectable individuals—far the greater number, indeed, of their respectable inhabitants—who are totally unrepresented in the corporations: but it would be most disastrous to suffer such persons to take a part in the administration of their local affairs; because, we are told, “there were fifty-four convictions for murder last year in the County of Tipperary!”\* The bill, indeed, provides a qualification, which will effectually exclude from the municipal councils and their constituency, persons in that rank to which offenders against the laws commonly belong. It is scarcely

\* In point of fact there were but twenty-three convictions for murder in all Ireland in 1836.

questioned that the changes which would follow in consequence of the enactment of this measure, would introduce a more respectable class of persons than are now found in the direction of the corporations: Mr. Young, the Tory member for Cavan, had the manliness and the candour to acknowledge this. But then, Lord Mulgrave went last summer upon a tour through many parts of his government; and he opened the prison doors to some persons confined for misdemeanours of various kinds, and it would be a dreadful thing, if these persons, so manumitted, should, by any turn in the wheel of fortune, be elected Aldermen and Burgesses of the New Corporations. Nay, the commission of the peace has been given to members of the National Association, and what then could hinder such persons being invested with the bearskin of office, and exercising all the functions of Lord Mayor and Sheriffs, to the total overthrow of the Protestant religion?

This kind of reasoning being *so conclusive*, who could wonder at the feverish anxiety that prevails, to come at *facts* to sustain it? Should we not even extend a little indulgence to those who are tempted, contrary to their wont, to stretch those "stubborn" conveniences to a conformity with their great purpose? There is no question that a capital political object will be gained, if by *assuming* the demoralization of the Irish *mobocracy*, through Lord Mulgrave's administration of the laws, it follows as a matter of course that the rights of the well-conducted and orderly part of the community must be intercepted, and the reform of universally acknowledged abuses suddenly stopped short. To those who labour in such a cause, the utmost latitude must be allowed; especially if, in addition to their public and patriotic motives, they are farther impelled by a hope of rising,—upon the ruins of the government which they would overthrow by such righteous means,—into posts of eminence, power, and emolument, far above any they ever could have expected to reach by the ordinary efforts of their professional talents. If ever men were justified in fabricating or swelling out facts, it were in a case like this, when, even if they tell lies without number, they do not tell them to no end.

That the statements made by the principals and accomplices in this plot are in a great measure untrue, and in no one instance confined to the simple and unadorned truth, is quite notorious to every person living in Ireland. A plot we call it; for never was concert or premeditated arrangement more palpable. The great Protestant Meeting, as it is called in the first of the *brochures* before us, was got up for no other purpose than to give the tone to the subsequent proceedings of the party in Parliament. No doubt the conveners of the meeting had received their instructions from the head quarters, previous to the campaign about to open,

together with a requisition for a certain contingent of moral *petards* and other offensive missiles, such as our Irish engineers are most expert in providing. Their resolutions were framed so as to form an admirable code of instruction for the guidance of all persons interested in the overthrow of the Government; and it was plain, even before Sergeant Jackson opened his mouth in Parliament, that calumny and misrepresentation were *the order of the day*. Indeed, the extraordinary falsehoods uttered by Emerson Tennent, at the Glasgow dinner, where Sir Robert Peel sat by, an approving listener, might have prepared the public in some measure for what was to follow. For a clever man, as Mr. Tennent is, and by no means blind to the advantages of *appearing to have* a character before the world, would not have gone *spontaneously* "o'er the sea," merely for the pleasure of uttering such monstrous inventions. He must have been sent to set the Glasgow Tories agape, that they might the more readily drink up the plausible and slippery dose which was in preparation for them, and so soon to follow. Mr. Emerson Tennent's speech was the signal shot to announce that the process of inflation was completed; and the Dublin meeting, as a pilot balloon, ascended into the regions of invention, before Sergeant Jackson's sweeping and swelling imposition,—

"To point to brighter Heavens, and lead the way."

The object of this dishonest game is, as we have before stated, to produce an impression on the minds of the people of England, unfavourable to the just claims of their fellow-subjects in Ireland to an equality of civil privileges. This they hope to effect by dint of constantly reiterating the assertion that the Irish are in a state of barbarous insubordination, and more likely to violate laws than to aid in their administration. But the pretended facts which they bring forward to prove their assertion, form altogether the most miserable body of evidence that ever was produced in opposition to a great and undeniable principle. And even if every word they state were true, what would it prove? Why, that crime prevails, to a dangerous extent, among the *lowest class* of the people, to *whom* it would therefore be unsafe to give additional power. But does that justify a denial of positive rights to as virtuous and peaceable a class of society as are to be found in any part of the world? We do not scruple so to denominate the inhabitant householders, the shopkeepers, and the merchants, of towns in Ireland; and these are the persons upon whom the Corporation Reform Bill proposes to confer—should we not say to restore—the privileges which citizens in every other country, even under the most despotic Governments, enjoy.



But those statements are as exaggerated, as the argument grounded upon them is false and delusive. The actual state of crime is grossly exaggerated, nor is its character such as to warrant any apprehension on account of the change in the political relations of individuals and classes, which would follow a full measure of Corporate Reform. Indeed, there can be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable man, who is even moderately acquainted with our social frame and constitution, that an extension of their just municipal rights to the intelligent and well-affected class who are now excluded from them, would materially contribute to the preservation of peace, and the general improvement of the people. In towns we are quite sure that such would be the effect; and that the riotous spirit and disorderly habits which are the disgrace and reproach of our local police, would yield to the "vigilant popular controul" of the renovated municipalities.

If it is untrue that crime prevails, at the present juncture, in Ireland, to an unusual degree, it is doubly false that it has increased since Lord Mulgrave undertook the government, or that the moral character of the country is retrograding under his administration. Yet these things have been asserted with most dogmatical assurance, by a gentleman whom we have lately seen extolled for his "ingenuous modesty."\* What degree of credit may be due to his statements on other subjects will appear when we come to analyze the contents of one of the pamphlets now under our review. But before we take it up, let us bestow a brief consideration upon this charge, grounded on what is called, in the slang of the day, "The State of the Country."

Ever since any segment of the Tory faction found itself in opposition to the existing government, the cry of danger to the lives and properties of the Irish Protestants, has been ringing most obstreperously in the public ear. Now fifteen years have nearly passed since Lord Manners and Mr. Saurin ceased to share between them the glory of administering justice for Ireland; and from the day that Lord Wellesley first set his foot on Irish ground as its chief governor, the same alarm of instant imminent peril has never ceased to "fright the isle from its propriety." Twice during that period a day was actually named for a general massacre of the Protestants; and scarcely a week has gone by; that the well-instructed scribes of the Tory faction have not howled forth their counterfeit notes of terror, or its orators sacred and profane—parliamentary and forensic—have not joined

---

\* *The Dublin Evening Mail* praises Sergeant Jackson's answers to the addresses of the Cork malignants, on account of the "spirit of ingenuous modesty running through them." One would have thought that of all living merit, his would least require such a "flambeau" to render it conspicuous.

their voices to the dolorous concert. It is a genuine Irish cry, "I will be killed and nobody shall save me." To attempt to soothe their minds or persuade them of the groundlessness of such fancies, is to have yourself at once set down among the abettors of the long hatched treason. They are "pleased with ruin," and indeed fatten indifferently well upon it; insomuch that there is nothing they resent more than the least endeavour to beguile them of it. Like King Richard the Second, when left in a minority, they are ready to exclaim to every one who ventures to persuade them that their throats are perfectly safe and their houses insurable—

" By Heav'n, I'll hate him everlastingly  
That bids me be of comfort any more."

The use which is made of this simulated terror has been already explained. Its open and avowed application to the purpose of defeating justice and right, in the case of Corporation Reform, betrays the cause for which it has been so long and so pertinaciously insisted upon and reiterated. This accounts for the eternal cuckoo note of Lord Westmeath and Colonel Perceval, of the *Quarterly Review*, of *Blackwood*, of the *Standard*, the *Mail*, and the numerous dirty little creatures that croak and thrive upon their droppings. It is the cry of "stop thief" raised by the runaway pickpocket, who sings out louder still and louder, as he finds the footsteps of those who will strip him of his booty, drawing closer to his heels.

These worthy Irishmen never rest from their labours. Even during the short recess from Parliamentary duty which was allowed them at Easter, their ingenuity has been busy in adding to the pile of slander and defamation which they had previously heaped upon their country. The reader may have seen a triumphant announcement in the Tory papers of the march of troops into the counties of Cavan and Longford, for the supposed purpose of suppressing an insurgent movement of the populace. Military detachments and reinforcements of police have in truth been sent into those counties, upon the urgent and vehement representations, as we believe, of personages high in rank and official importance; but when they arrived, they were asked by the gentlemen and magistrates on the spot, "*what had brought them there?*" So little need was there of their presence to put down an insurrectionary spirit in the peasantry, that the Orangemen actually fancied that the troops had been sent for their own special annoyance and inconvenience; and a journal much in the interest of that party,\* insinuated that two companies of the

\* *The United Service Gazette.*

93rd had been stationed at Kingscourt and Ballyjamesduff, for the mere purpose of "quartering them upon the refractory Orangemen of those villages." No outrages of a very unusual or particular nature were committed,—nothing had occurred to indicate a combination against the authority of the laws, or an united effort to unsettle any of the established securities of property. No armed parties traversed the country—no nightly meetings were held—nothing, in short, appeared in the state and conduct of the peasantry, which the regular guardians of the public peace, located amongst themselves, were not sufficient and able to meet and to suppress. But then the registry of Cavan was going against the Orange interest; and the late election at Longford (in whatever manner a committee may decide) had been signally disastrous to it. It would be therefore an important object gained, if the members and ex-members could have gone back after the holidays with a marvellous tale about cantonments and patrolling parties, rendered necessary for the protection of the Protestant inhabitants. And if they could have poured the leperous distilment into the ears of Englishmen, that such results flowed, in the one instance, from the agitation of a contested election, and in the other, from the bare expectation of one, such an impression would undoubtedly add to the prejudice which the dishonest arts and persevering malignity of the Tory faction have infused into many a well-meaning and liberal mind, against the farther extension of civil rights to the people of Ireland. But Lord Mulgrave, by acceding at once to their requisition for military assistance, brought these representations to the test, and exhibited their total want of foundation.

The "thimble-rig" game, which some few of the learned Judges have been playing about the *state of the calendar*, is, if anything, more contemptible than the outcry of the journalists and peddling politicians about *the state of the country*. To-day the calendar is no test, because it is light; to-morrow it proves every thing, as being so heavy. In Waterford it is inconsequential; in Kilkenny it furnishes a test for a woe-denouncing homily. Its lightness argues intimidation; its crowded numbers are evidence of wide-spread disaffection and crime. If presumed malefactors cannot be come at by the police, then there is a hideous combination to screen the perpetrators of the direst offences, and set justice at naught. If they come forward and are acquitted by a jury, it is a trick to hide the real criminal. The calendar is a glass for all occasions, upon whose magic surface the skill of the judicial conjuror can raise what forms he will.

Baron Foster's charge at the late Tipperary Assizes was a beautiful illustration of the uses of a calendar. He rolled his excited frame to and fro, with all the mystic agitation of a Pythian

prophethess, whilst he poured out a flood of eloquence upon the multitude and enormity of the offenders registered upon it. To transfer his entire charge to these pages would be to take an advantage of him (and of our readers too) of which we hope we are incapable. Let it suffice to say of it, that it embodied all the wisdom and the arguments which had ever been launched against calendars in general, with all that could be launched against that calendar in particular; repeating, with solemn effect, upon so novel and so interesting a theme,

“What oft was said, but ne’er so well express’d.”

Every single culprit upon the black catalogue was made available, in his order, to the swelling out of the Baron’s fearful climax; and then—when all the murders, and all the manslaughters, and all the felonious attempts, had each served their turn in this way—he wheels about, and shows that *their very number was a fiction and a pretext*, to cheat justice of its proper victims. Six persons, whom the Tipperary magistrates had committed for manslaughter, were arraigned for the offence; but the evidence against them amounting to this, that they had been seen in a crowd where a fight took place and a man was killed, they were, of course, acquitted. But the Baron, instead of deducting these six names, as a man of less penetration might have done, from his muster-roll of damnable cases against the character of the county, goes right round and turns their very innocence to its dispraise. “I verily believe,” he says, “that the appearance of a number of persons, giving themselves up for trial is merely a screen for the party really guilty.”\* If this be not making as much as can be made of that two-edged tool, the calendar, we are as yet children in the science of *judgecraft*, as it is carried on in our happy country.

This case also proves how easy it is to make a *good calendar* for the nonce. The magistrates, who would take informations on so light grounds as those which are here stated, and commit six men to prison to abide their trial for manslaughter, are what Mr. Saurin would have called “valuable fellows.” They will always be able to furnish materials for inflicting a fit of the horrors upon a Tory judge. A constant and ready supply may be relied on from such industrious supporters of “The State of the Country.” We have just seen a ludicrous instance of the art used in keeping up the stock, so as not to exhaust the whole of so excellent a commodity at one time. The managers of these affairs, whether they be of the quorum or of the police, do not

---

\* Tipperary Free Press.

belong to the family of *Shallow*, at all events. They look beyond to-day, and, like a prudent henwife,

“Haud ignara ac non incauta futuri,”

always like to reserve a *nest-egg* for another occasion. A number of the “Roscommon-Journal,” published since the late assizes, has the following promising intelligence:—

“MURDER.—Twenty persons, charged with the murder of Daniel Noonan, of Tarmon, in December last, (and for whose apprehension a reward of fifty pounds was offered by the Lord Lieutenant), but who have since evaded the vigilance of the police, surrendered themselves on Friday se’nnight to Charles Mac Dermot, Esq. and were bailed in heavy sureties to appear at the next assizes.”

Here are *twenty murders* to cut a flourish in the Roscommon calendar at the end of a short period of three months! Twenty “convictions,” the learned Member for Bandon may call them; for—as we shall see anon—he, after the manner of a great prerogative lawyer of old,\* sometimes holds men guilty before trial—

“Castigatque auditque dolos.”

We hope to see Baron Foster on the Connaught Circuit next time. [If he goes, *we shall see him*, and “D.V.” hear him too]; and, Oh! what a ‘larum he will ring upon “glaring turpitude;” how will the atrocity of the people be magnified to his imagination by the appearance of these *twenty mortal murders* upon the calendar; and then, after the culprits shall have served their generation in that glorious record, how will their acquittal, or perhaps discharge without prosecution, or upon “No Bills,” excite his wrath at their having given themselves up in such numbers, merely to screen the *one delinquent* who really committed the *one homicide*. These are the arts, by which Ireland is made out to be in a state of conflagration.

The charges of the Lord Chief Baron on the last circuit are quite of a piece with those of his learned brother in the South. Wherever he came he had a word of deep suspicion to throw upon the character of the people, except in Armagh, where only 128 traversers were indicted for riotous Orange processions. It is remarkable that the Chief Baron had to congratulate that county on its *peaceable condition*—and he did so, as he said, not on the ground of its calendar, which is altogether a fallacious test, but because he had so received it from the efficient Clerk of the Crown. At all the other towns on the circuit his charges were very crabjuice, alternating in a most striking manner, in that respect, with those of Mr. Justice Torrens, with whom he travelled, and who found nothing but subjects of congratulation

---

\* Rhadamanthus.

and approval wherever he came. Thus the Chief Baron opened the commission at Drogheda, by saying, that judging from the report of the calendar, he could not felicitate that town on the state of its tranquillity. At the next town, Dundalk, Judge Torrens opened the commission, stating that on comparing the calendar with those of other counties, he found it extremely light. In Downpatrick, the Chief Baron played first fiddle again, and although he had been ready enough to turn the state of the calendar at Drogheda to the dispraise of the people, here he declares it to be a most fallacious test, and that judges were much mistaken who took it as the basis of their congratulations. At Antrim, Judge Torrens could see no cause for alarm or censure. At Armagh, the Chief Baron relaxed a little, and commended the peaceable state of the county, although the gaol was so full, that the Crown-Solicitor was obliged to have recourse to a sort of decimation, with regard to the Orange rioters, and select *sixteen* out of 128 for judgment, setting all the rest at large. At Monaghan, Judge Torrens found the calendar heavy; but he showed that the argument which is usually built upon a heavy calendar, would have been indeed fallacious in that case, for "many of the cases, he said, were of such a description, that they might have been disposed of at quarter-sessions or even at petty-sessions."

In confirmation of this latter observation of Judge Torrens, we shall mention two cases which occurred at those assizes. The first is that of Patrick Coleman and others, who were indicted for assaulting a dwelling-house and for a riot. Judge Torrens in charging the jury, said, "This was one of those cases to which he had alluded in his charge to the grand jury. A want of discrimination had been evinced by the magistrates who had sent this case for trial to the assizes. It should have been tried at the quarter-sessions." In the other instance, Thomas Moorhead and others were indicted for burglary and robbery, also for assaulting a dwelling-house, for appearing in arms and for a riot. Here were offences sufficient to fill a moderate calendar; but when the offenders came to be tried, the counsel for the prosecution dropped all the felonious parts of their indictment, and merely charged them with misdemeanors. Judge Torrens observed, that "as the capital charge was thus abandoned, he took it for granted that it could not be sustained, and therefore it should not have been made. The counsel for the Crown were not to blame, for they had been sent here to prosecute cases, which, *by informations taken before magistrates*, are represented of a serious nature, but which, upon investigation, would probably be found like a case which had

come before him at these assizes. *It was called a Whiteboy offence*, but turned out to be a mere riot by *drunken men, seeking for a farther supply of whisky*. By such a practice the magistrates of the county were doing—what he was quite sure they did not wish—causing it to be supposed, contrary to the fact, that the country was in a state of insurrection. But thus it was, when the most trivial quarrels at public-houses were swelled out, and nothing appeared upon the calendar, but Whiteboyism, murder, and highway robbery.” This most culpable practice of magistrates, in sending prisoners for trial on charges which cannot be sustained by evidence, and of referring to the assizes numerous cases, such as the inferior tribunals can and ought to adjudicate, has been materially instrumental in swelling the number of apparently heavy crimes upon the calendars. Knowing of what stuff our county justices are composed, we do not at all wonder at their persevering in the trick, particularly when every day’s arrival of the post brings them intelligence of the good use which it is made to serve in Parliament. Latterly the device has become so common, that at the late assizes, not only Judge Torrens animadverted upon it, but several other members of the bench in different parts of Ireland did the same; and even Baron Foster himself was obliged to objurgate a magistrate in Tipperary, for having held a man improperly in custody on a grave charge, whom he ought to have admitted to bail on a lighter one.

The number of persons made amenable to justice during the last five years, is considerably greater than that of the five preceding years; and even the return for 1836, exceeds by some hundreds that for 1835; a circumstance which seems to give infinite satisfaction to our Tory “Countrymen and lovers.” They rejoice in the fact, as affording ground for impeaching the government of Lord Mulgrave, whom they accuse of having, by his clemency, and by the manner in which the criminal law is administered by his law-officers, given encouragement to offenders. In their anxiety to fasten a charge upon him, they overlook the fact, that the increase of which they complain began three years before his system of government was introduced into Ireland; even when Mr. Stanley was wielding the Coercion Act, and Mr. Blackburn putting forth the terrors of justice in the awful form of a Special Commission. None of them will have the audacity to deny that Ireland is now in a state of halcyon peace, compared to what it was at that time. And yet to look at these returns, the number of (so-called) offenders is far greater than it is stated to have been in 1832. Were the crimes actually committed of equal number,

we have not the slightest hesitation in declaring our belief, that the persons brought to answer for them at the bar of justice would double in amount those whom Lord Stanley's vigour, and Mr. Blackburn's adherence to the good old "simple plan," could lay hold of. The reason of this can be no other, than the superior efficiency of the measures pursued by the present government to enforce the law. Tipperary—the great example in every dispute on the subject—is certainly and undeniably in a state of comparative tranquillity; it was remarkably so throughout the entire year of 1836; yet in that year upwards of 1,500 persons were placed within the animadversion of the law. Is not this an evidence of the energy and success with which Lord Mulgrave pursues offenders, instead of being, what Sergeant Jackson and others would represent it, a proof that he gives them encouragement and shelter? Who was it that put a stop to the shameful compromises, by which the most notorious rioters in that county contrived, for many a long year, to elude justice and laugh at the power of laws? Were not those compromises effected by the connivance—aye, frequently the interested and corrupt connivance—of the magistracy; and were they not abolished through the determination of the present government, to visit every infraction of the peace with its proper punishment? In a former article,\* we showed how Mr. Howley, the Assistant-Barrister appointed by Lord Mulgrave, to preside at the Quarter Sessions of Tipperary, knocked that scandalous system of evasion to pieces. He estreated the recognizances of all—both accusers and accused—who failed to appear to informations relating to that class of feuds and outrages which, though of trivial import, had they terminated with the occasions which gave rise to them, tended, perhaps more than any other cause, to degrade and barbarise the character of our people. Hence the number of prosecutions for riots and assaults was greatly increased, although it is admitted, we believe, on all hands, that the frequency of those offences has been very much diminished; and this—which is one of the peculiar triumphs of Lord Mulgrave's straight-forward and impartial system of government—has furnished his enemies with a pretext for attacking it; for it has swelled the number of cases in the calendar by the addition of all that class of offenders who had been previously allowed to commit outrages and atone for them in private, by a kind of civil process of *Lynch Law*. Of the fifteen hundred offenders, whose assemblage in the list afforded such a *crow* to Serjeant Jackson, nearly eight hundred were amenable for offences which,



before Lord Mulgrave's time, had been rarely brought into court: and of the whole number for Ireland, above twelve thousand appear to have belonged to that class.

Another, and a very material help towards the same effect, has been contributed by the improved state of the police. That force is every year becoming more effective; and the change has been strikingly manifest since the passing of the act of last year, which took the men entirely out of the hands of partizan magistrates, and taught them, that the best way to obtain advancement in the service, is not to curry favour with individuals, but to show themselves steady and alert in the proper duties of their station. A number of excellent magistrates have also been commissioned by the government, and sent into districts where the services of active and judicious men might avail, for the detection of criminals who would otherwise escape. The exertions of these gentlemen, combined with the efficiency of the police, have proved successful in bringing numerous offenders within the grasp of justice, whom those persons who formerly undertook to provide for its vindication would never have gone in quest of. All these circumstances should be taken into consideration, when the enlarged numbers of persons committed for trial are mentioned; and we think that candid and honourable men of all parties, who compare the actual state of the country at the present, to the horrors which it is but too easy to connect with any former period, will view these increased numbers of offenders now made amenable, both as proofs of Lord Mulgrave's zeal for the suppression of crime, and also as complete refutations of the charges of laxity and undue clemency, which have been so freely brought against him.

With respect to the actual state of crime in Ireland, as indicated by these returns, we shall take a similar return for England, which we suppose no Tory will yet describe as having been, or being, in a state of total demoralization and rebellion; and let us compare it with one for the same year for Ireland. We take the return for 1835, because it is immediately before us. If the tables for the last year had been published, we should prefer them. But before we go into the particulars, it is right to make our readers understand that the tables of criminal offenders in England and Wales, though arranged in the same form as those which compose the appendices to the annual reports of the Inspector-General of Prisons in Ireland, are yet compiled in so different a manner, that a strict comparison between the two would be unfairly disadvantageous to Ireland. The English tables, we have reason to believe, do not comprise all the prisons in the country—the Irish tables do. From the

English table, common assaults are excluded—in the Irish they contribute largely to the apparent amount of crime. The returns from the Irish gaols also include great numbers who have been committed by single magistrates, or at Petty Sessions, and whose cases are not of sufficient importance to be even made the subjects of a regular indictment. Military offenders also—all soldiers sentenced by court-martial to imprisonment, for breach of the articles of war—swell the Irish returns, the gaolers being obliged to include in these lists every person who may have been in their custody during the year. With all these points saved in favour of Ireland, we pray the reader's attention to the following table of some of the principal crimes which were charged, in England and in Ireland respectively, in the year 1835:—

1835.	in Eng <sup>l</sup> and Wa	in Irel	offer against Ireland
Total number of offenders	20,731	21,205	474
Murder	78	447	369
Shooting at and assaulting with intent to murder	134	191	57
Conspiring to murder	—	19	19
Convicted of these offences	85	191	106
Unnatural crimes	79	4	—
Assaults	844	6,175	5,331
Assaults on peace-officers in the execution of their duty	421	79	342
Burglary	281	135	146
Taking and holding forcible possession	—	175	175
Robbery of arms	—	68	68
Arson	67	53	14
Setting fire to crops, plantations, heath, &c.	9	8	1
Attempt to commit arson	4	6	2
Riot, and feloniously destroying buildings, machinery, &c.	18	19	1
Killing and maiming cattle	34	25	—
Sending letters threatening to burn houses, &c.	15	22	7
Other malicious offences	4	95	91
Assembling armed to aid smugglers	21	15	6
Being out armed, to take game by night, and assaulting gamckeeper	184	184	—
Administering unlawful oaths	—	54	52
Total number convicted	14,729	10,787	3,942
Total number acquitted and discharged	5,977	5,989	12
Executed	34	27	7

The balance is against our country, in some items, and favorable to it in others; but taking into account that we have no poor law—that families comprising 2,385,000 human beings, in Ireland, are in a state of actual destitution—that the unquiet

have no occupation, the impatient scarce any restraint—that the harassing and depopulating oppressions of landlords and village tyrants, are still carried on with unrelaxed severity—and that numerous provocations and temptations solicit to the commission of violence here, which do not exist in happier countries—the wonder should be, that the disproportion between the state of crime in England and in Ireland is not much greater than it really is. Let any honest-minded Englishman ask himself the question—What would be the state of Kent, if its peasantry were as wretched as those of Tipperary or of Donegal?—and then let him, if he will, impute the disorders which still continue, to the mild but firm system of government which Lord Mulgrave has introduced, with already such manifestly good effect, and so ripe a promise of peace and permanent tranquillity hereafter.

The speeches of Serjeant Jackson, delivered in the debates upon the first and second readings of the Municipal Reform Bill, may be looked upon as the manifestoes of the party which has put him forward. He brought some heavy accusations against the conduct and policy of the Irish government, which he sustained by cases so diffusely and circumstantially detailed, as to lend an air of authority to what he said. The pamphlet before us, however, entitled “A Familiar Epistle to Serjeant Jackson,” knocks about his *facts* in a manner sufficiently “familiar,” certainly, and not the less convincing for the sturdy simplicity with which it takes them in hand. The motto is rather a ruffling one to a person of his sensitive as well as ingenuous modesty: “Tell Truth and Shame the Devil!” But if the facts and statements wherewith the writer arms himself, to meet those of the learned gentleman, are undeniable—and we are quite satisfied they are so—the advice is not ill bestowed. We are even half disposed to hope that it may not be entirely thrown away; for a more complete exposure, in a plain unpretending way, could scarcely have been made of the bombastic nothings, with which Serjeant Jackson’s speeches are swelled out; and he must be insatiable of the glory arising from such flights of rhetoric, if, after this correction, he attempts to soar into the same fanciful region any more. It is intimated, indeed, in this epistle, that he is getting ashamed of the notoriety he has acquired, and inclined to be angry with those who made him a “cat’s-paw and dupe” to propagate their slanders. This is taking rather a favourable view of the matter, and *letting him down easy*. But in reality there does not appear any other reasonable mode of accounting for the strange, and not more strange than confident, assertions which he was induced to make,

than by endeavouring to believe that he was himself deceived. A mind violently prejudiced is peculiarly open to imposition, and liable to be seduced by any tales, however gross, in favour of its own prepossessions. Nevertheless we are in doubt as to Sergeant Jackson's supposed *repentance*; for, as yet it has brought forth no fruits conformable to our notion of such a happy change; but on the contrary, we observe symptoms of a spirit, though more wary perhaps, still implacable and contumacious as before.

In dealing with the matters of fact which Sergeant Jackson stated, and boasted that he could prove, the writer of this pamphlet uses little or no art. He selects the most important of the cases, which he places in parallel columns to the answers which have already been given to them, supplying such other information from public and from private sources, as seems necessary to strengthen his vindication of the Irish government, and to exhibit the glaring injustice of the charges imputed to it. In this way he upsets, one after another, all the showy cases relied upon by the learned Sergeant and his understrapper, Mr. Emerson Tennent, leaving their attacks destitute of a single proveable fact of any serious import to add weight or credit to them or to their authors.

The displeasure of the Tory party against the Crown for having ceased to object to jurors with a mere view to obtain convictions, *per fas aut nefas*, is ascribed to its true motive, their hatred of free institutions.

"Your first article of impeachment is grounded on the antipathy which every genuine Tory has to the *Trial by Jury*. It never can answer the purposes of your party, nor consist with the objects for which they desire to rule Ireland, that the Irish Catholic peasant should be tried by his peers. You all mouth loud enough, Heaven knows, about 'the Constitution,' and the besetting dangers by which you are pleased to say it is surrounded; but not one of you can endure the thought of this most venerable and essential part of the constitution subsisting amongst the Irish people in its original strength and integrity. As long as you held the sway, the people of this country never felt it to be a safeguard. It was a dubious protection to innocence, an insecure defence against oppression, an almost invariable scourge to liberty and civil rights; and if the power were yours to-morrow, such most certainly you would endeavour to make it again."

This is a fair and true exposure of the hypocrisy of the faction. They are great sticklers for forms of liberty, as long as they can, by convenient and pliant instruments, strip it of its power: and they mean nothing more, when they cry out for the Constitution. The complaint that "the prerogative of the Crown has been abandoned"—the *prerogative of packing juries*!

—is fully answered by an extract from the speech of Mr. Woulfe; and the author then proceeds to show, by a striking instance, the offensive grossness of the practice which has been thus wisely superseded.

“As to your generous scepticisms on the subject of jurors having ever been objected to by any former Attorney-General, or with his permission, on the ground of their religious or political opinions, I admire it the more, because incredulity is not often your failing. But ask Mr. Blackburne. It is unnecessary to send you farther back. Ask him, I say, why Mr. Patrick Lalor, the late member for the Queen’s County, was, at least, twenty times during his Attorney-Generalship, challenged by the Crown Solicitor on the Home Circuit? I name Mr. Lalor, not that he is the only one that has been pointedly excluded, but because he is known to the people of England, whom you profess to enlighten, and who will, from his exclusion, the more readily appreciate the *animus* of the practice. Hundreds beside him, in the same respectable class of society, were uniformly and most insultingly thrust aside, for no other assignable cause than because they were warm politicians on the Catholic side; and up to the date of Lord Mulgrave’s happy arrival on our shores, it was manifest to all persons of that description,—and at every assize they were made to feel it too,—that the Crown mistrusted them, and feared to submit the most trivial case of agrarian outrage to be tried by any but—Conservatives.”

The several trials of the presumed murderers of Mr. Carter having been cited, as illustrating the bad tendency of the reliance which modern Attorney-Generals place on the jury panel, Mr. Tickell, a barrister who conducted the business of the Crown on the Home Circuit, has furnished an account of those trials, exposing most fully the gross inaccuracies of Sergeant Jackson’s statements. It appears from this letter, that the great damning facts put forward to sustain that part of his charge, were all exaggerated or invented.

“It is not true, for instance, (says the author of this *Epistle*,) that on the first trial, a participation in the murder was admitted upon the jury, nor that, on the second, a man who had been convicted of a *similar crime* was admitted in like manner. ‘It is also now apparent, although you were either ignorant of the fact, or did not think it would serve your argument to acknowledge it, that on the third trial the prosecution failed through the perjury or defective memory of the approver.’”

All these things are made manifest by the letter of Mr. Tickell, who, being of strong Tory predilections, is a most valuable witness in such a case. Would that all Irish Tories were imbued with the like honourable feelings, or that they could be brought to think that a gentleman is bound to tell truth, whether it makes for his party or against it.

Mr. Emerson Tennent, not to be outdone in anything by

Sergeant Jackson, thought fit to bolster up this part of the charge with a parallel illustration from the Monaghan Assizes. With characteristic recklessness, he stated a case as against this government, with which this government had nothing whatever to do, and the circumstances of which were in no manner or degree applicable to the present mode of empanelling the petty jury. For the trials, of which he speaks, were had while Mr. Blackburne was Attorney-general; and in every one of those trials, according to a very common practice of that man of "liberal opinions," the Roman Catholic jurors were set aside. We are happy to find that O'Connell has taken this matter in hand, and means to *show up* the choice of Belfast in Parliament. But the hero maintains his brazen front, and still remains imperturbably *true* to his *story*; except, indeed, that he is not quite certain as to the dates. 'The following observations upon this subject are well put:—

"I venture to predict, that when the returns relating to this case (which Mr. O'Connell will move for) are forthcoming, you will have no great reason to be proud of your northern ally. He, indeed, appears in no degree abashed by the notice, but shows every sign of a determination, quite natural in such a gentleman, to *die hard*. He is confident, forsooth, of everything—'*except the dates*;' that is, he is still quite sure that the three successive prosecutions failed, because of the rule which Lord Mulgrave's attorney-generals have acted upon; but whether those failures occurred since or before that rule came into operation, and its authors into power,—mass, he cannot tell!—'*Non mi ricordo*.'

"This is the fable of the *Wolf and the Lamb* revived:—'Villain! how dare you muddy the stream (of justice) out of which I must drink?'—'How can that be, an't please your Worship, when the stream flows down from you to me? Don't you see how the mud descends from Blackburne point?'—'No jesuitical evasions, caitiff! I care not which way it flows; the water is muddy, and if it be not you, it must have been your father.'—'Alas, sir, my father was matton before I was born.'—'None of your Popery, wretch! It was your grandfather then, for I forget *the dates*; but you shall die the death.'

"But it is not enough for your friend to defend himself in this way; he takes up the cudgels, and soundly whacks his impugnant. *Accusat Munilia, si rea non est*; that was the height of Roman impudence; but Belfast surpasses Rome in that quality; for her sons prefer their bills of indictment from the dock. Mr. Emerson, unable to deny that he has brought false charges, flies off from the troublesome office of defending himself, to the more easy and congenial task of adding to his offence. He reiterates the accusation, that the government entered into a corrupt compromise with murderers, and furnished them with the means of emigrating to America.

"The truth of the matter is this. After the culprits had stood three trials for their lives, the Counsel for the Crown agreed to the offer of

their solicitor, that they should plead guilty of manslaughter, and be conveyed, 'under a rule of transportation, to America. Sentence of transportation for life was passed upon them accordingly, *which sentence is still in force*; so that should they ever come back to Ireland, or to any other part of the United Kingdom, they are liable to be prosecuted and hanged as *returned convicts*. The sentence was carried into effect, as all sentences of the kind are, at the public expense. Mr. Emerson may call this *emigration*, if he likes, and endeavour to represent it as such to those who will believe him.

"It is not denied, that it would have been more agreeable to justice, as, I am sure, it would have been far more satisfactory to the government, if those criminals had been sent to a convict settlement. But how was that to be effected? The crown counsel had every reason to despair of obtaining a conviction, had they resorted to the extreme measure of a *fourth trial*; and, therefore, they recommended the only course likely to ensure the country against those effects of evil example and impunity, which might have ensued from turning such desperate characters as the prisoners loose upon society again. Mr. Emerson Tennent is, perhaps, the only man who would think of turning the conduct of the government in this affair into an occasion of censure. But, detected before the face of the country in an attempt to fasten a false accusation upon the government, it was an object of importance to him to raise a cloud under which he might take shelter from public contempt, and cover, if possible, his *mistake of the dates*."

These tender-hearted souls are pleased to term the leniency which his Excellency displayed towards some unfortunate offenders confined in the county prisons, in the course of his very useful tour in Ulster and the other provinces, *an abuse of the prerogative of mercy*. But here, as in all their attacks, they fail miserably in proofs. Sergeant Jackson displays his talent at amplification, as usual, both freely asserting *the thing that is not*, and greatly magnifying that which is. Thus he says, that the Lord Lieutenant had "released prisoners guilty of all sorts of offences," when it is known that his clemency was only extended to petty offenders, whose term of punishment was within a short time of expiring; and then he not only distorts the cases which he selects as instances, but represents them in a glass like that of Banquo, wherein a single image is multiplied *ad infinitum*. "In Cavan," he says, "the noble lord had let out *fourteen*; and amongst the peccadilloes for which *they* had been incarcerated, were merely firing at the Revenue Police, a very trifling one, no doubt, particularly in these peaceable times." How extremely facetious! But, barring the wit of it, there is no excuse for taking such liberties with facts; for only *one* person came under that description, and his release from farther punishment appears to have been an act of common humanity, such as no government out of Austria (where a sentence of imprisonment is

almost equipollent to one of death), could hesitate to perform. It would occupy too much of our space to go into the full particulars of this man's case, which have been very fully and satisfactorily stated in Parliament. It was a peculiarly hard one; and was recommended strongly to the favourable consideration of the Government, by a number of Tory magistrates and deputy lieutenants of Cavan, who were highly gratified at his discharge; for, exclusively of the severity of his lot, he was a *sportsman*, and therefore a very useful kind of person in their eyes. But when Sergeant Jackson thundered his denunciations upon Lord Mulgrave for having released him, these gentlefolk were all as mute as stockfish. The remark which follows upon this subject, is applicable to other cases than the one before us; it conveys both a just reproof and a wholesome admonition.

“ I think it is not very creditable to the gentlemen who interfered so warmly in behalf of Maguire, that one only of all their number has now come forward,—having seen the conduct and motives of the Lord Lieutenant, in acceding to their request, so grossly aspersed,—to justify him and undeceive the public. But the rest are Tories; and need I tell you, Sir, that it is one thing for an Irish Tory to sneak in at the back door, and solicit favours from a liberal government, for himself or his dependents, and another thing to step forward and acknowledge the obligation; particularly when by so doing, he might run the risk of doing justice to that government. There are not many of the tribe capable of the virtue which *you* boast;\* for most of them have their price: but I do believe that ‘the world and its contents’ (after they had made sure thereof) would not bribe them to be faithful and true to the present government, one moment longer than opportunity might serve them of doing a shabby turn.”

Sergeant Jackson brought forward three cases to support his assertion, that partizans had been improperly raised to the magisterial office; namely, those of Lord Milltown, Mr. Cassidy, and Mr. L. C. Smyth; and in every one of these cases the pamphlet before us furnishes demonstrative evidence, that he stated circumstances at total variance with the truth. The attempt to make out one of these gentlemen to be a convict, and another an instigator to the crime of arson, are among the most daring flights of our learned countryman's muse. It is pitiful—wondrous pitiful—when efforts so well intended fall short of the mark; and never was knight-errant in more rueful plight in this respect, than our coifed brother, who, having gone forth determined to substantiate *every thing* “thoroughly,” has

---

\* “The world and its contents would not bribe me to take part in the administration of the affairs of Ireland, under the present government.”—*Sergeant Jackson's Speech, Feb. 7.*



returned to his rest, having proved to the whole world that he can substantiate *nothing at all*.

That a Catholic should be advanced to any post beyond the dignity of a tidewater, is a rank offence in the nostrils of Orange piety. "The Protestant interest" is thereby endangered, and a certain very agreeable form of "*the Protestant succession*" exposed to interruption. It matters not that there are seven Catholics in Ireland to one person who holds any other religious profession, and that *some of them* are at least as well qualified and as well entitled to assist in the direction of public affairs, and in the various departments of justice, as their neighbours. The real old Tories have not yet learned to see the necessity of departing from the track in which the Beresfords moved so gloriously for themselves, and for the land that bore the weight of them. They would still keep office sacred, as a pleasant fortress to guard the church, and as the only comfort which remains to her children. The straightforward Orangemen make no mincing about it. They speak out. But there is a spurious breed of Tories sprung up in modern times, who affect a great liberality, and are quite willing to open the door of place to every Catholic who happens not to have any chance, or, peradventure, any paramount claim to public distinction. To such they would widely open their arms, as long as they modestly remain at a respectful distance. But let them once approach the golden precincts, and admiration of their merit becomes suddenly absorbed in surprise at their presumption. Of this hypocritical school, having the modern *Joseph Surface* at its head, are most of the gentlemen who have been marked out for office under a change of rulers. They must put on a seeming of equity, which neither they nor their masters would ever consent to put in practice. Thus Sergeant Jackson affects the greatest sympathy with Sergeant Ball, because he was not made Solicitor-General; (a circumstance of which Sergeant Ball himself has not complained;) and exclaims, God forbid that there should be any hesitation about appointing a Catholic! And so likewise the *veracious* sycophant of the *Standard* newspaper pretended a great love for Mr. O'Loghlen; and espoused his wrongs with angry zeal, when he accepted a seat on the Exchequer Bench, inviting him to wait awhile, and he should be the first man whom the Tories would provide for. Mr. O'Loghlen, however, has been promoted higher than any Tory government—even for purposes of deception—would ever dare to raise any Catholic, and he at once becomes a theme of vituperation among the base yelpers of this base and unblushing faction.

"Your objections are restricted to *those Catholics only* who have got

anything. With regard to others, whose turn has not yet come to provoke jealousy, you profess the greatest liberality, and even a regret that they have not been promoted. 'God forbid that any hesitation should be evinced by his Majesty's government in appointing a Roman Catholic, who was fit for the situation, and unblemished in his personal and political character. You would just as soon have appointed him as a Protestant.'—Oh, *just as soon!* This is so kind and conciliatory of you, whilst your 'whole-hog' associates in Glasgow, and at the Lord Mayor's great room, join in a simultaneous bellow against the promotion even of a Papist police-constable. But *they* had not the Attorney-Generalship in prospect to hold their genius in rebuke.

"Mark how fearlessly Mr. Emerson Tennent—that zealous Protestant and bright ornament to whatever profession of Christianity he may espouse,\* delivers himself on the subject. He had the courage, at Glasgow, while Sir Robert Peel sat by with an assenting simper, to say that 'in Ireland, at the present day, the religion of the Protestant is even a more effectual bar to his appointment or promotion to any one office, judicial, military, or civil, than was the faith of the Roman Catholic before the removal of the penal laws.' Just fancy

'The matchless intrepidity of face,'

which the man must be able to command, who, even on the banks of the Niger, or in the backwoods of Louisiana, could venture upon such a declaration. But such friends are often very convenient to a leader who has a character to maintain. They

'Answer with a ready \* \* \*  
'To save their masters.'

I should not wonder, therefore, if Sir Robert set a very high value upon the services of your 'honourable friend,' or if he had already assigned him a post in his intended government. 'In the selection of the judges,'—thus he goes on—'In the selection of the judges, the most learned and eminent men at the bar, *though of liberal principles*, have been passed over and insulted, to make way for the promotion of *individuals* who had no other recommendation than the profession of the favoured religion.' Now, *the only individual* of the '*favoured religion*,' who has been promoted to the office of a judge, is Mr. O'Loghlen; and I would almost leave it to yourself—certainly, if you did not belong to a parliamentary minority (a situation too\* trying to the conscience), I would leave it to you, absolutely—to decide, whether a single man at the bar, of *any* or of *no* 'principles,' (and there are men of this latter description, eminent enough in the profession), has a right to complain of Mr. O'Loghlen's promotion. Mr. Emerson talks of '*individuals*,'—to tickle the ears of his Scottish hearers. Two or three, more or less, seem to make no odds in his account of numbers; but I would fain know whom he means to designate as the men of 'liberal principles,' who have been unjustly passed over and insulted. He cannot allude to Mr. Blackburne, because, you know, *he* would not degrade or disgrace himself by

---

\* He is believed to have coquetted with more than one in his time.

accepting anything from this government, and, therefore, it was no insult, but quite the contrary, to pass him over, without tempting him with an offer."

An extract follows from a speech of Mr. Shea Lalor, at "the so-much-aborred Association," which shows that the share of patronage which, as yet, has fallen to the Catholics, is considerably short of "even-handed justice."

"He had received a letter from a fast friend of Liberalism in England—from a man of ability—a man whose services had been very great. He drew his attention to a resolution that had been adopted in the late conservative meeting, expressed his surprise that it had remained uncontradicted, and asked for a statement of the truth from him (Mr. Lalor), that he might lay it before his friends in England. The resolution to which he referred was the one in which it was said that the patronage and prerogative of the Irish government were abused; that partizans alone were promoted to office; partizans alone were made assistant-barristers, magistrates, and police-officers. He made out an estimate of these various offices, and he would communicate the result to them.

"There were,

- 1 Inspector-general of constabulary, Colonel Shaw Kennedy. No one would call him a partizan or a radical. He was certainly a fair man, and whatever his private feelings might be, he would suppress them, and not allow them to interfere with his public duty.
- 2 Deputy Inspectors, both *Protestants*.
- 4 Provincial Inspectors, *one of whom is a Catholic*.
- 1 Receiver-General; he is no partizan.
- 1 Chief Clerk, a *Protestant*.
- 36 Sub-Inspectors, *four of whom are Catholics*.
- 188 Chief Constables, *only thirty of whom are Catholics*.
- 18 Paymasters, *three of whom are Catholics*.

"Thus, out of 251, the entire number, there were but *thirty-eight Roman Catholics*.

"He next went to the MAGISTRACY. There were, 39 STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES, *six of whom were Catholics*.

"There were, 33 Assistant Barristers, among whom there were but *eight Catholics*; and of the other 28 there were about *four Liberals*. Even among the Roman Catholics there were some of whom the less was said the better.

"There were, 32 County Lieutenants, *two of whom were Roman Catholics*.

"He then alluded to the county Kerry, and stated that at the late election, out of 16 Deputy-Lieutenants, not one had supported the principles of the present government; out of 119 Magistrates there were but eight who voted for them. He cited those matters, not for the purpose of criminating the government, but merely to show how very false were the statements advanced in the resolution of the conservative meeting."

The refutation of the charge so pertinaciously reiterated, of

Lord Mulgrave's having appointed assistant barristers who have created a fictitious constituency, in order to swamp the Conservative interest, is the best written and the most triumphantly sustained portion of this spirited defence. We regret that we have not reserved room for any portion of it.

The "State of the Country" is the last subject noticed by our author. Sergeant Jackson had frightened the House with a list of enormities brought to justice in Tipperary during one year; at the end of which, by a blunder into which his eagerness to slander his country betrayed him, he named twenty-one cases of a crime, from the taint of which, blessed be God, our soil is pure. The last Irishman who was implicated in such an abomination, bore a name which the learned sergeant would be long sorry to "name to ears polite;" at least he did not allude to this horrifying case before the eight lords who solicited his presence at the Lord Mayor's house in Dublin. His loose way of stating facts for the advantage of his own side, is admirably exemplified in the following passage:—

"Now so it happens, by one of those felicitous mistakes which you so often contrive to make in favour of your own side, that the imposing array of 'Convictions' here paraded by you, comprises all persons who were *charged with offences* in Tipperary during the year. In this number are contained, not only those who were convicted, but also all those who were acquitted, all those against whom no bills were found, and all those who were discharged by proclamation without any prosecution. Every one of these you assume to have been *convicted*. 'How many,' you exclaim to your horror-stricken auditors—'how many do you think were *convicted* for murder? Not less than *fifty-four*. How many for shooting at with intent to kill? *Twenty*. For assaults of various kinds with intent to kill? *Seventy-three*. For manslaughter? *Fifty-one*.' According to this calculation, there were one hundred and ninety-eight persons convicted of taking away life, or attempting to take it away, in the one year. But if you look again at the return, you will find, that of the fifty-four persons charged with murder, *five* only were capitally *convicted*; twenty-five were acquitted; against thirteen bills were not found, and eight were discharged without prosecution! Of *twenty* charged with shooting with intent to kill, *two* only were *convicted*! A large proportion of those charged with grievous assaults and manslaughter were *convicted*; but twenty-nine of the number were acquitted or discharged on sureties; and forty-two of them sentenced only to short terms of imprisonment.

"But what shall be said to your last unclean aspersion against your country? Is it possible that you believed it? *Twenty-one*! Pah! Why, I will give you, not the calendar for Tipperary, but all the calendars of all the counties in Ireland; and if in our criminal annals, for the last twenty-one years, you can discover as many cases of that disgusting nature, I will allow that you have proved the vilest and most

infamous demoralization, and succeeded better than many other Irish birds, your fellow-labourers and compeers, in befouling the nest out of which you were taken. I suppose you are prepared 'thoroughly to substantiate' this too—that twenty-one convictions took place in Tipperary on this abominable charge—and then to argue, by learned deductions, and logic all your own, that Lord Mulgrave's tour through Ireland, and his release of certain minor offenders from the gaol of Clonmel, produced the unnatural state of society out of which these enormities sprang. Let the people of England, however, understand that the odious imputation is totally groundless. It has not even the equivocal merit of 'lying like truth;' for not only were there no convictions for that nameless crime, but there was not *one single charge*."

Having professed a candid belief that the infamous imputation alluded to had originated in an unintended mistake, the pamphlet concludes with the following burst of honest indignation:—

"But hold, Sir; never was error less excusable than in this case, when you come forward as a public accuser, voluntarily, officiously, after a long and painful preparation, and after the solemn prelude with which you vouched for the accuracy of 'every single statement' you should make. The plea of '*Non volens erravi*,' must not avail you: '*Non volens igitur penas dato*,' is its just and righteous answer. The blunder you have committed would, in an ordinary case, be merely ridiculous; but as an instance of the avidity with which a class of Irishmen grasp at every pretext, however monstrous or absurd, to defame their country, it is too melancholy a subject for laughter. You are slow to believe in the manifest signs of improvement and civilization, which the influence of a mild and paternal government has produced. If others rely on them, and confide in the able and honest men, who, in spite of all the efforts of your party to depress the character of their native land, are raising it above obloquy and contempt, you cry, 'More shame for them!' But let any dirty tale, or hideous aspersion—no matter how gross or incredible—be thrown in your way, you catch it up as bread from heaven, without inquiry, without hesitation, and in the full assurance of faith, that whatever tends to blacken—to malign—to 'make us traduced and taxed of other nations,' must be true. This is more than an error of judgment. It is a wilful participation in the slander; and the community which has been belied through your means will hold you accountable for it."

There is a journal published in London, called *the Record*;—*a gospel newspaper*,—

"Whose pious face some sacred texts adorn;

As artful sinners cloak the secret sin

To veil with seeming grace the guile within."

It is conducted, we believe, by an old man-of-war's man, who cruised for some years in the troubled waters of Irish controversy, and was, though not the first surely of the present age and generation the boldest

"That practis'd falsehood under saintly show."

We think we cannot conclude our observations on the calumniators of Ireland better, than by an extract from this one who has stuck to her as a leech. If it serves no other purpose, it may serve to keep the poor worried Sergeant Jackson *in countenance*. It is, "*in fact*," the sort of comment which is germane to his speeches.

"The exposure made by Sergeant Jackson, of the proceedings of the Irish Government, was calculated to produce a powerful impression both on the House of Commons and the country. His statements completely altered the tone of the debate, and must have made Lord John Russell and his friends ashamed of what his Lordship had said about the 'miserable, monopolising minority,' as he was pleased to designate the Protestants of Ireland. *In fact*, the doings of Lord Mulgrave were such, that *even Lord Morpeth is said to have expressed his surprise* at circumstances with the existence of which he had previously been very partially acquainted !!!"

ART. VIII.—1. *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Humphry Davy, Bart.*

*L.L.D., F.R.S., Foreign Associate of the Institute of France.*

By John Davy, M.D. F.R.S. 2 vols. 8vo. London. 1836.

2. *Consolations in Travel, or, The Last Days of a Philosopher.*  
*Third edition.* London. 1831.

3. *Salmonia.* *Third edition.* London. 1833.

WERE the question to be proposed, as to which is the most important branch of human knowledge, it is probable that many very different answers would be returned, in accordance with the different opinions which men had formed of the *summum bonum* of life. Chemistry, as a purely intellectual science, cannot certainly be ranked with astronomy and the higher mathematics; nor yet, perhaps, with the classics and *belles lettres*, as a liberal study. It offers the most irrefragable proof and most striking example of the inductive philosophy, but from its accustoming the mind to demonstrative evidence, its general tendency may be thought to induce a scepticism of disposition in regard to such matters as depend for their proof on human testimony. Neither has chemistry any direct tendency to form pure principles of action, or to improve and cultivate those moral qualities of the human heart, in which the true dignity and real happiness of man consist. We apprehend that its chief apology is to be found in its numerous relations to the wants and comforts of society and the arts of life; and, on this

ground, we can readily understand why, in a utilitarian age like the present, it should be esteemed as one of the most popular of all the sciences.

The phenomena which chemistry discloses, are precisely of that kind which captivate the popular taste;—brilliant and almost magical in their nature, they appeal at once to the senses, while, on the other hand, they require no great depth of understanding, or previous knowledge of the subject, to apprehend the general principles on which they depend. It is not, however, the mere captivation of the fancy by striking experiments that the modern chemist aims at producing; neither is his object, like that of the ancient alchemists, to transmute the baser metals into gold, or to discover a universal elixir to prolong life, but to promote the health and happiness of his species by the multiplication of the comforts of social existence. Chemistry allied to the arts, has been the grand source of national aggrandizement and wealth, by enabling our manufacturers to compete with those of every other nation, and our merchants to monopolise the commerce of the world. Directed by its lights, we have been introduced into the very arcana of nature; and armed with its powers, we have been enabled to subdue the most refractory substances to our will. By Franklin, we have been taught to disarm the lightning of its fury; by Davy, to avoid the terrific consequences of subterranean combustion; by Cavendish, to set free the imprisoned elements of water; and by Wollaston, to draw platinum wire finer than the finest gossamer, by which, it is said, that philosopher realized a sum of not less than £30,000. If, however, we may be allowed to judge of the importance of discoveries by the extent and permanency of their effects, we should not hesitate to assign the first place to Mr Watt's discovery of the steam-engine,—a discovery, which, we venture to affirm, is only paralleled by one other event in the annals of the world—that is, the art of printing; although it may be doubted, whether it is not calculated to effect even still greater changes in the physical than that has done in the intellectual world. In short, the dreams of the philosophical enthusiast are now no longer improbable, but a boundless prospect of new and inexhaustible discovery has been opened to our view.

Among the chemists of the eighteenth century, the names of Black, Cavendish, Priestley, and Scheele, hold a conspicuous rank; but they were each distinguished by a peculiar merit; Black for the simplicity and precision of his processes and the accuracy of his reasoning powers; Cavendish for the great delicacy and neatness of his manipulations, and the caution with which he advanced to general conclusions,—so that most of his

processes were, from the very first, of a finished kind, requiring no subsequent correction, and remaining unimpaired amidst the progress of discovery; Priestley for the ingenuity with which he devised chemical apparatus, and for the light which his multifarious knowledge and research shed over every branch of the science; and Scheele for the boldness and originality of his mind, which disencumbered chemistry of many erroneous views, and paved the way for future discoveries. Such were the peculiar excellencies of those eminent chemists; but the claims of Davy were of a still higher order, whether we consider the peculiar nature of his genius, or the discoveries which it enabled him to effect. He seemed to combine in his own individual character, the separate excellencies of all those who preceded him. Bold and ardent in disposition, and patient and persevering in investigation, his mind seemed equally adapted to minute enquiry, and the most extensive generalization of facts. In the commencement, as well as in the decline of his life, when the imagination is less subject to the supremacy of reason, he exhibited many proofs of the natural force of this faculty of his mind; and to this source, we must refer that inexhaustible fertility of expedients and dexterity as an experimenter, for which he was so remarkably distinguished in his more mature years. Clear and accurate in his reasoning, and imbued with the true spirit of the Baconian philosophy, he was able not only to compare all the existing facts of chemistry, so as to deduce general conclusions; but, to seize with intuitive sagacity, the remote resemblances of facts, and with no less singular adroitness, to devise, new experiments for testing their accuracy, and confirming and extending their proofs; so that in all respects his mind was peculiarly formed for original investigation, and for extending the boundaries of science. The circumstance, however, which, perhaps, more than any other, added to his general fame, was the wonderful ingenuity of his mind in surmounting obstacles, so as to render available to the arts of life, the abstract principles of science.

It strikes us as one great objection to the life of Davy, that it has been written too soon after his death, to enable us to judge of the real practical importance of many of his discoveries; many of which require time to confirm their truth, or to develop their consequences; we do not, by any means, subscribe to the opinion that the intrinsic merits of scientific discoveries are to be estimated by the extent of their practical and beneficial consequences; yet, when such consequences are of an universal kind, they cannot but encircle the inventor's brow with an additional halo of glory, and emphatically entitle him to the appellation of a permanent



benefactor of his species. We can no more dissociate the effects which the discoveries of Newton and Bacon have respectively produced on the mixed and experimental sciences, than we can disconnect the association of the New World with the name of Columbus, or of the steam-engine with that of Watt. There is also another objection to precipitate biography, which is, that we are unable sufficiently to distance ourselves from the object to observe its real proportions. Mont Blanc improves as one recedes from its vicinity, and heroes lose much by that familiarity which makes us acquainted with their daily wants; inferior excellencies, in short, are incompatible with the grander styles of composition, and inevitably injure the general effect. The imagination is delighted in representing the character of such a man as Davy as the lofty embodiment of some celestial genius, alike free from the interruptions of human passion, and disengaged from the encumbrances of matter; but the illusion wholly vanishes when we are informed of the minuter incidents of his life, which individualize the portrait, and deprive it of that loftiness which it otherwise would possess. Besides, it is impossible to divest the mind of partial considerations. The illustrious dead leave behind them a glorious train of rosy twilight, which insensibly impresses all spectators. Friendship and jealousy equally tend to bias the judgment, and to warp the intellectual vision, nor is it possible, until time and distance have removed their disturbing influences, to form a correct judgment of character.

These observations have been forced from us in consequence of two memoirs, both the productions of friends, having been written of this illustrious individual within the short period of five years; but written, as it would seem, in a spirit of opposition. We might have expected, if any where, certainly in the present instance, an agreement of opinion. Dr. Paris and Dr. Davy, the former the friend, the latter the brother of the deceased, were both admitted to his intimate acquaintance, and both enjoyed his private confidence, and yet they differ essentially in the account which they give of some important features of his character. We may also believe that, in many other respects, in which they agree, they have equally been misled by their partialities, of which, indeed, we shall have occasion to adduce more than one example in the present notice. In other respects, both these lives are written with great taste and judgment, except perhaps that Dr. Davy would have consulted his own and his brother's dignity more effectually, by abstaining from a controversial spirit, which mingles itself with the whole

texture of his narrative. The following is the account which he gives of the motives which first engaged him in this undertaking :—

“The nature of Dr. Paris’s work confirmed me in my design. There appeared to me to be much in it that was objectionable, many things which were incorrect, and that the general tone and tendency of it were to lower the character of my brother in public estimation; not, indeed, as a man of science and an original inquirer, but as a man and a philosopher; and to deliver his name to posterity with a sullied reputation, charged with faults which he would have indignantly repelled if living, and which it has become my duty, believing the charges to be unfounded, not to allow to pass unrefuted, now he is no more.

“In writing the life of my brother, which I now offer to the public, from the commencement to the termination of my labour, I have kept in view one great object—the development of his character as fully as possible, trusting that his best vindication from calumny will thus be ensured; and believing, with his excellent and attached friend, Mr. Poole, that ‘the more his *whole being* is known, the more the *man* will be esteemed and loved, the more the philosopher thanked and venerated.’”—p. viii.

Sir Humphry Davy was born at Penzance, in Cornwall, on the 17th of December, 1778, of humble parents, and many anecdotes are recorded of his early years, which evince the independence of his mind and his preference of the study of nature to the cultivation of books. He received the rudiments of his education under Dr. Cardew, of Truro, but this gentleman has frankly confessed that he did not perceive any of those foreshadowing indications of genius which sometimes foretell the future philosopher. Out of school-hours, indeed, he generally took the lead among his school-fellows, was foremost in all sports, was particularly skilful in inditing love-letters and valentines for his comrades, played all manner of pranks, and exhibited an early taste for fishing and poetry. Looking, as we are too apt to do, to the infancy of a man of genius, with a view of discovering the germs of future greatness, it would be extraordinary if we did not sometimes meet with events of that equivocal nature, as to bear an application to a preconceived view; although this kind of evidence is altogether fallacious, and of the same nature exactly as those coincidences which have been invariably alleged in support of dreams and second sight. The poet says,

“————— men’s judgments are  
A parcel of their fortunes, and things outward  
Do draw the inward quality after them.”

but we apprehend that full as good reason exists for believing that the quality of men’s minds differ as much by nature, as the

external configuration of their bodies, and that therefore the particular direction of genius is as likely to be determined by inward as by outward circumstances. The human mind has been compared to a sheet of white paper or to a shapeless block of Parian marble, capable of any design which the painter or the sculptor may choose to impress upon it; but surely it would be quite as reasonable to apply the same similitudes to the body, which is known to suffer many important modifications from the effects of food, climate and education, although no one has been so bold as to affirm that differences do not naturally exist between the features of individuals who have been subject in all respects to the same external influences. Dr. Paris has laid much stress on the romantic scenery of Cornwall, on its geological characters, and on the various events appertaining to a mining district, as circumstances which appear to afford an easy solution of the particular bias of Davy's mind; and, that these circumstances may have had some influence we are not disposed to deny: indeed, we are fully persuaded that the external features of nature cannot fail to impress, more or less, a permanent disposition on the inhabitants; although, when we consider how few among the number manifest the peculiar tokens attributable to such causes, we are compelled to assign them a much lower rank among the determining influences of character, than the original and constitutional peculiarities of the individual.

Although it appears that young Davy took no great delight in the daily routine of Greek and Latin assigned to him at school, yet we must not imagine that his mind was allowed to expend itself in the mere volatilities of childhood. At a very early age he showed a considerable aptitude for poetry, and composed with great facility. His mind was of a reflective cast, which was still farther developed by the following plan of study, which was sketched out by him at the early age of sixteen, upon his being first apprenticed to Dr. Borlase, of Penzance; and, although for the two following years his principal studies related to metaphysics and theology, yet he found time to devote himself to other subjects with considerable profit, and in 1797 he commenced in real earnest the study of natural philosophy. His early chemical reading appears to have been confined to "Lavoisier's Elements of Chemistry," and "Nicholson's Dictionary of Chemistry;" but he performed many chemical experiments in Dr. Borlase's laboratory, and showed an extraordinary aptitude in converting the various articles of the kitchen and shop into apparatuses for his purposes. Necessity is said to be the mother of invention, and it is probably to this early habit of being forced

to surmount difficulties, that we must refer his unrivalled dexterity as an experimentalist in after life.

- |   |                          |                     |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------|
| “ 1. THEOLOGY, or RELIGION,                     |                          | } taught by nature. |
| ETHICS, or MORAL VIRTUE,                        |                          |                     |
|   |                          | } — by revelation.  |
| 2. GEOGRAPHY.                                   | 4. LOGIC.                |                     |
| 3. MY PROFESSION.                               | 5. LANGUAGE.             |                     |
| 1 Botany  | 1 English                |                     |
| 2 Pharmacy                                      | 2 French                 |                     |
| 3 Nosology                                      | 3 Latin                  |                     |
| 4 Anatomy                                       | 4 Greek                  |                     |
| 5 Surgery                                       | 5 Italian                |                     |
| 6 Chemistry                                     | 6 Spanish                |                     |
|   | 7 Hebrew                 |                     |
| 6. PHYSICS.                                     |                          |                     |
| 1 The doctrine and properties of natural bodies |                          |                     |
| 2 Of the operation of nature                    |                          |                     |
| 3 Of the doctrine of fluids                     |                          |                     |
| 4 Of the properties of organized matter         |                          |                     |
| 5 Of the organization of matter                 |                          |                     |
| 6 Simple astronomy                              |                          |                     |
| 7. MECHANICS.                                   | 9. HISTORY & CHRONOLOGY. |                     |
| 8. RHETORIC and ORATORY.                        | 10. MATHEMATICS.”        |                     |

We now approach the great determining circumstance of Davy's life, which was his introduction to Mr. Davies Giddy, afterwards Mr. Davies Gilbert, President of the Royal Society, and Mr. Gregory Watt, of Birmingham, by whose introduction he was farther made acquainted with Dr. Beddoes, of Bristol, who had recently founded a “Pneumatic Institution” in that city, for the purpose of ascertaining the medical virtues of the different gases, a class of remedies from which much was expected at that time, although they have since been proved to be unavailing. Proposals were accordingly made to Mr. Davy to undertake the superintendence of these experiments, which, whether attended with favourable or only negative results, could not fail to make him favourably known to the public. The proposals were accepted, Davy abandoned the profession to which he was originally destined but never cordially attached, and from this period we have principally to contemplate him in the character of a chemist, pursuing a glorious career of discovery and usefulness. It was here that he committed the first sin against prudence in becoming an author; first, in 1799, of some miscellaneous “Essays on Heat and Light, &c.,” and on the following year, of his “Researches, Chemical and Philosophical, chiefly concerning Nitrous Oxide, and its respiration..” The former, although

they display much ingenuity and the prevailing boldness of his genius, are yet but imperfect performances, and strongly tinged with the precipitancy of youth; but the latter is a publication more worthy of the subsequent fame of this great chemist. It excited, in a remarkable degree, the attention of the scientific world at the time, and considered as the production of a youth, barely twenty-one years of age, justly pointed him out to Count Rumford, who was then looking out for some one to fill the chemical chair of the recently established "Institution of Great Britain," as one of the most rising philosophers of the age. We give the following interesting extracts from the second of these works, premising merely, that nitrous oxide or the "laughing gas," as it has been termed, was generally considered not only irrespirable, but as eminently noxious; an opinion which is so far true, that the experiment of breathing the pure gas cannot at any time be made with perfect impunity. After breathing the nitrous oxide atmosphere for a considerable time, Sir H. Davy says,

"I had now a great disposition to laugh; luminous points seemed frequently to pass before my eyes; my hearing was certainly more acute, and I felt a pleasant lightness and power of exertion in my muscles; in a short time the symptoms became stationary; breathing was rather oppressive; and, on account of the great desire of action, rest was painful. I now came out of the box, having been in precisely an hour and a quarter.

"The moment after, I began to respire twenty quarts of *unmingled* nitrous oxide: a thrilling, extending from the chest to the extremities, was almost immediately produced. I felt a sense of tangible extension, highly pleasurable, in every limb; my visible impressions were dazzling, and apparently magnified; I heard distinctly every sound in the room, and was perfectly aware of my situation. By degrees, as the pleasurable sensations increased, I lost all connexion with external things; trains of vivid images rapidly passed through my mind, and were connected with words in such a manner, as to produce perceptions perfectly novel. I existed in a world of newly-connected and newly-modified ideas; I theorized, I imagined that I made discoveries. When I was awakened from this semi-delirious trance by Dr. Kinglake, who took the bag from my mouth, indignation and pride were the first feelings produced by the sight of the persons about me. My emotions were enthusiastic and sublime, and for a minute I walked round the room, perfectly regardless of what was said to me. As I recovered my former state of mind, I felt an inclination to communicate the discoveries I had made during the experiment. I endeavoured to recall the ideas: they were feeble and indistinct; one collection of terms, however, presented itself; and, with the most intense belief and prophetic manner, I exclaimed to Dr. Kinglake, '*nothing exists but thoughts! the universe is composed of impressions, ideas, pleasures, and pains.*'"

Mr. Tobin and Dr. Roget's statements correspond in all main particulars with the above description. The former says,

"When the bags were exhausted and taken from me, I continued breathing with the same violence; then suddenly starting from the chair, and vociferating with pleasure, I made towards those that were present, as I wished that they should participate in my feelings. I struck gently at Mr. Davy, and a gentleman entering the room at the moment, I made towards him, and gave him several blows, but more in the spirit of good humour than in anger. I then ran through the different rooms in the house, and at last returned to the laboratory somewhat more composed."

Dr. Roget says,

"All the vital motions seemed to be irresistibly hurried on, as if their equilibrium had been destroyed, and every thing was running headlong into confusion. My ideas succeeded one another with extreme rapidity, thoughts rushed like a torrent through my mind, as if their velocity had been suddenly accelerated by the bursting of a barrier, which had before retained them in their natural and equable state."

It is evident that the nature of the sensations produced by this extraordinary gas, bear a closer resemblance to the half-delirious dream produced by opium, or to the intoxication produced by Champagne, than to any distinct state of the waking thoughts. On one occasion, when under the delightful influence of this gas, Sir Humphry Davy uses the expression, "I seemed a new being;" on another, "I seemed a sublime being newly created;" and, on a third occasion, that he felt "as if possessed of new organs." We are much mistaken if in the "vision" recorded in the author's "Consolations in Travel," written in the decline of his life, we do not trace the erratic inspirations of this intoxicating element.

The following discovery, viz. that silicious earth exists generally in the epidermis of hollow plants, imparting strength to their fabric without impairing either their flexibility or lightness, affords a happy instance of that quickness of apprehension and rapid power of generalization, to which we have adverted in a former part. It appears that one of Mr. Coates' children, at Clifton, accidentally rubbing two pieces of bonnet-cane together in the dark, perceived a luminous appearance. "This phenomenon," he says, "was sufficiently novel and curious to induce me to examine it, and I found that all canes of this kind when briskly rubbed together, produced sparks of white light." At first he thought that this phenomenon was electric; but, upon examination, he found that it depended on the silicious or flinty substance which enters into the composition of the epidermis or outer bark, which, on being rubbed together, produces luminosity on exactly the same principle as the flint and steel.

Proceeding with the enquiry, he found that the same substance not only existed in *all* the foreign canes and bamboos, but in the English reeds and grasses, giving support to their lofty growth, protecting their bark from the action of insects, and apparently performing a part in the economy of these feeble vegetable tribes, similar to that performed in the animal kingdom by the shell of the crustaceous insects. The ignition of bamboo plantations, therefore, does not, like the ignition of the American forests, depend on the simple force of friction, but on the introduction of a new element, which facilitates combustion. It is from such simple observations as these that the greatest discoveries have taken their rise, just as the mightiest rivers, bearing fleets on their bosom and washing the whole breadth of continents, derive their source from some obscure fountain among the mountain ridges.

The following extract from a letter addressed to his friend, Mr. John Tonkin, a short time before the death of the latter, exhibits that delicious state of the feelings which attends the first outset and first successes of life; before flattery and deceit have accomplished their baneful influence on the human mind. Alas! for the dewy freshness of our feelings, they as little endure the rough contact of the world, as the fresh bloom of the Orleans plum endures the rude handling of the clown. The letter is dated,

“ Clifton, Jan. 12, 1801.

“ I am at this moment very healthy and happy; I have had great success in my experiments, and I gain a competence by my pursuits, at the same time that I am (in hopes at least) doing something towards promoting the public good. If I feel any anxiety, it is that of being removed from you, my mother, and my relations and friends. If I was nearer, I would endeavour to be useful to you; I would endeavour to pay some of the debts of gratitude I owe to you, my first protector and earliest friend. As it is, I must look forward to a futurity that will enable me to do this; but, believe me, wherever I am, and whatever may be my situation, I shall never lose the remembrance of obligations conferred on me, or the sense of gratitude which ought to accompany them.”

His letters to his mother are still more strongly indicative of the same feelings. “ We are going on,” he says, “ gloriously; our patients are getting better; and, to be a little conceited, I am making discoveries every day.” And speaking of Dr. Beddoes, he says, “ you have been told he is fond of money; I assure you it is quite the contrary;—he is good, great, and generous, and Mrs. Beddoes is the best and most amiable woman in the world. I am quite naturalized into the family, and I love them the more I know them.”

A great poet of the present age has said, "if Davy had not been the first chemist, he would have been the first poet of his age;" an observation which the miscellaneous nature of his studies at Clifton, as revealed by his note book at this period, shows, was not without some colour of support. Detached poems and essays, as far removed from scientific subjects as the Antipodes, form the principal ingredients of this *galimafrée*, and had his talents not been diverted into other channels, who can say that he might not have rivalled the inimitable author of the Waverley novels? seeing that in early life he exhibited the same taste for romantic incident, and the same love of poetry. It is probable that this comparative freedom from restraint, favoured the natural development of his mind, and allowed those faculties which were naturally the strongest, to expand themselves to their full extent. Nothing can be more unphilosophical or contrary to nature than the modern system of education, which reduces all intellects to the same standard, and trains them up after the same model.

Sir Humphry Davy removed to London in the early part of 1801, and soon acquired the reputation of being one of the most distinguished and eloquent lecturers in the metropolis. Elevated to the highest pitch of literary fame, surrounded by the aristocracy of literature and rank, courted by the fashionable, and complimented by the scientific world, it is not surprising that his mind should have lost somewhat of its equilibrium, and his habits and manners have undergone some change. The charge preferred against him by Dr. Paris, that he lost that simplicity that constituted the charm of his character; and, intoxicated with vanity, assumed the garb and airs of a man of fashion, is not, perhaps, entirely without foundation, although it has been strenuously resisted by Dr. Davy. Great allowances are undoubtedly to be made to men who raise themselves by the force of their own talents from the common level of society, into note and consideration. As their labours increase, their leisure is necessarily abridged, and as their circle of acquaintance enlarges, they have less time to bestow on individuals. Nay, as their intellect expands, it is natural to expect that their tastes should also alter, so as to lead them to prefer the society of men of their own standing and calibre, to the former acquaintances of their youth. Still there is no excuse for capriciously throwing off friends formed in the maturity of the understanding, of which, we fear, several examples might be given in regard to Davy. Mr. Brande, in the last edition of his "*Manual of Chemistry*," feelingly laments the withdrawal of Sir H. Davy's confidence from himself, during the latter years of his life, notwithstanding



that it was by his recommendation that he succeeded to the chair of chemistry at the Royal Institution, and in spite of a long and confidential intercourse and correspondence for a series of years.

"After his election," he says, "as President of the Royal Society, Sir Humphry Davy began to withdraw his kindly feeling towards the Royal Institution, and with it his confidence in myself, which, as I never willingly offended him, or wished to do so, was peculiarly grating to me, under all the circumstances of the case, and more especially, as holding the office of Secretary to the Royal Society, our mutual intercourse was inevitable."

In 1802, Mr. Davy, having been elected Professor of Chemistry to the Board of Agriculture, commenced a series of lectures before its members, which he continued to deliver for every successive session for ten years; and in 1813, he gave these lectures to the public, under the title of "*Elements of Agricultural Chemistry.*" As a lecturer, though very popular, Davy was not of the highest order. Energetic and overflowing with information of a novel and interesting kind, it scarcely required that he should possess any other qualities to command attention; but, in fact, he possessed a great command of language and a most extraordinary felicity of illustration, so that he easily disentangled the most complicated subjects, and rendered them intelligible to all. His style, however, was too ornate for scientific subjects, and deficient in that classic simplicity which is best adapted for philosophical investigations; faults that are still observable in his latest written productions.

Of the eight lectures which constitute the "*Agricultural Chemistry,*" the three first belong rather to the department of botany than to that of chemistry, and contain, therefore, little that is new. The fourth relates to the chemical constitution of soils; the fifth, to the atmosphere and the functions of vegetables; the sixth and seventh treat of the interesting subject of manures, showing how they are converted into the nourishment of the plant, the changes produced in them by the processes of fermentation and putrefaction, and the utility of mixing and combining them with each other. The last refers to the effects of burning and irrigation on lands, and elucidates the theory of convertible husbandry, founded on the regular rotations of different crops. Upon the whole, however, although these lectures afford abundant food for reflection, they fall short of the author's previous labours, of which we shall presently speak, on electro-chemistry, and may be said to have disappointed public expectation. The following is the account given of the formation of peat-mosses:—

"In instances where successive generations of vegetables have grown upon a soil, unless part of their produce has been carried off by man, or

consumed by animals, the vegetable matter increases in such a proportion that the soil approaches to a peat in its nature, and, if in a situation where it can receive water from a higher district, it becomes spongy and permeated with that fluid, and is gradually rendered incapable of supporting the nobler classes of vegetables."

"Many peat-mosses seem to have been formed by the destruction of forests, in consequence of the imprudent use of the hatchet by the early cultivators of the country in which they exist. When the trees are felled in the outskirts of a wood, those of the interior are exposed to the wind, and, having been accustomed to shelter, become unhealthy and die in their new situation; and their leaves and branches, gradually decomposing, produce a stratum of vegetable matter. In many of the great bogs in Ireland and Scotland, the larger trees that are found in the outskirts of them bear the marks of having been felled. In the interior, few entire trees are found; and the cause is, probably, that they fell by gradual decay, and that the fermentation and decomposition of the vegetable matter was most rapid where it was in the greatest quantity."

After discussing the comparative value of manures and of different substances employed to modify the soil, such as lime, sand, burning, fallowing, &c., the author makes the following observations on the succession of crops, adopted by the most judicious modern agriculturists:—

"It is a great advantage in the convertible system of cultivation, that the whole of the manure is employed, and that those parts of it which are not fitted for one crop, remain as nourishment for another. Thus, in Mr. Coke's course of crops, the turnip is the first in the order of succession; and this crop is manured with recent dung, which immediately affords sufficient soluble matter for its nourishment; and the heat produced in fermentation assists the germination of the seed and the growth of the plant. After turnips, barley with grass seed is sown; and the land, having been little exhausted by the turnip crop, affords the soluble parts of the decomposing manure to the grain. The grasses, rye-grass, and clover remain, which derive a small part only of their organized matter from the soil, and probably consume the gypsum in the manure, which would be useless to other crops: these plants, likewise, by their large systems of leaves, absorb a considerable quantity of nourishment from the atmosphere, and, when ploughed in, at the end of two years, the decay of their roots and leaves affords manure for the wheat crop; and at this period of the course, the woody fibre of the farm-yard manure, which contains the phosphate of lime, and the other difficultly soluble parts, is broken down; and, as soon as the most exhausting crop is taken, recent manure is again applied."

Perhaps there is no question concerning which there has existed greater difference of opinion than that of the state in which manure ought to be ploughed into the land; whether recent, or after it has gone through the state of fermentation. But the following experiment of our author has set at rest this question for

ever, by showing, that when manure has been allowed to ferment in the farm-yard, and pass into the state of *short muck*, as it is called, it has thrown off most of its volatile parts, and lost from one third to one half of its most useful constituent elements.

"In October 1808, I filled a large retort, capable of containing three pints of water, with some hot fermenting manure, consisting principally of the litter and dung of cattle. I adapted a small receiver to the retort, and connected the whole with a mercurial pneumatic apparatus, so as to collect the condensible and elastic fluids which might rise from the dung. The receiver soon became lined with dew, and drops began, in a few hours, to trickle down the sides of it: elastic fluid, likewise, was generated. In three days, thirty-five cubical inches had been formed, which, when analyzed, were found to contain twenty-one cubical inches of carbonic acid; the remainder was hydro-carbonate, mixed with some azote, probably no more than existed in the common air in the receiver. The fluid matter collected in the receiver, at the same time, amounted to nearly half an ounce: it had a saline taste, and disagreeable smell, and contained some acetate and carbonate of ammonia.

"Finding such products given off from fermenting litter, I introduced the beak of another retort, filled with similar dung, very hot at the time, amongst the roots of some grass in the border of the garden. In less than a week a very distinct effect was produced on the grass: upon the spot exposed to the influence of the matter disengaged in fermentation, it grew with much more luxuriance than the grass in any other part of the garden."

We must now advert to Sir H. Davy's discoveries in electro-chemistry, a department of science which may be said to be of his own creation, and which constitutes, undoubtedly, his chief claim to be received as a chemical philosopher of the first class. The origin of these enquiries may be dated in 1790, when Galvani discovered that the contact of certain metals with the nervous and muscular fibres of frogs excited convulsions, although he was not aware of the real cause of this phenomenon. Volta, suspecting that electricity was the cause of the convulsions, sought for means of accumulating the exciting agent, and at length succeeded in constructing the Voltaic pile, which consists of a number of successive alternations of different metals, with substances acting chemically upon one of them, which may be increased, of course, to any extent. On April 30, 1830, Messrs. Nicholson and Carlisle accidentally discovered that water was decomposed by this pile, and immediately added to this capital fact the knowledge of the decomposition of certain metallic solutions, and the circumstance of the separation of the alkalis on the negative plates of the apparatus. Mr. Cruikshank and Dr. Henry soon contributed some important facts on the same subject; and in the month of September in the same year, our

author contributed his first paper to Mr. Nicholson's *Journal* on the same subject, followed by six others in the course of the succeeding year. In these papers the author established the intimate connexion between the electrical effects and the chemical changes going on in the pile, so as to arrive to the general conclusion that the one is always dependent on the other. It appears, indeed, from the "Additional Observations," appended to his "Chemical Researches," published in 1800, that his mind was even then fully awakened to the important bearings which this new agent was likely to have on chemical investigations,—bearings which he kept steadily in view ever afterwards, and by means of which he at length succeeded in attaining a rich harvest of chemical results, such as has never fallen to the lot of any other individual.

At a subsequent period, when tracing the history of voltaic electricity, the author observes, in reference to this period, that "the voltaic battery was an alarm bell to experimenters in every part of Europe; and it served no less for demonstrating new properties in electricity, and for establishing the laws of this science, than as an instrument of discovery in other branches of knowledge; exhibiting relations between subjects apparently before without connexion, and serving as a bond of unity between chemical and physical philosophy." Accordingly, many were the candidates who rushed into this field of enquiry,—Heisenger, Berzelius, Cruikshank, Pachioli, Wollaston, Biot, &c., contributed various important facts, although none as yet had succeeded in clearing the enquiry of certain preliminary difficulties which obstructed its farther advancement. It was asserted, upon the faith of the most careful experiments, that if two separate portions of water were electrized out of the contact of substances containing alkaline or acid matter, yet, by some means or other, both acid and alkaline matter was always generated, and that the acid uniformly appeared at the positive, and the alkali at the negative poles of the battery; thus rendering it doubtful whether these substances were products or merely educts arising from the action of this extraordinary agent. The investigation of this question was taken up by our author in the beginning of 1806, and gave rise to the first Bakerian lectures, "On some Chemical Agencies of Electricity," which, as bold and striking models of philosophical research, founded on the inductive method of Lord Bacon, have never, perhaps, been excelled, and display, in a remarkable light, the masterly energies of Davy's mind in passing from experiment to theory, and in the employment of that theory as the source of new, profound, and elaborate researches. The first step in this investigation was to repeat

all the experiments on the subject performed by others, and to compare their results; from which he deduced the fact, that although alkaline and acid matters were certainly evolved, notwithstanding the employment of the purest distilled water, yet that the quantity in which these matters occurred was always smaller in proportion as the precautions taken in purifying the water were more rigid; from which it clearly appeared that these substances were educts, and not products attending the decomposition of the water. He next directed his attention to the vessels employed, and succeeded in ascertaining that these, in many instances, afforded the extraneous matters, so that glass, porcelain, and many mineral substances, yielded them in much greater abundance than agate, gold, or platinum, although it was still found that water, which had been redistilled at a low temperature in a silver alembic, afforded them in appreciable quantities. By pursuing the enquiry, however, these impurities were successively traced to the hands of the operator, or to the circumambient air, and hence it was finally and satisfactorily proved, that oxygen and hydrogen, the pure elements of water, were *alone* evolved when the experiment was performed *in vacuo*, in cones of the purest gold, which had not been handled, and with the purest distilled water. By these researches, therefore, it was determined, not that electricity is capable of creating new substances by a mysterious agency, but that it possesses the power of controlling chemical affinities in a marvellous manner, and of decomposing the most refractory substances with the most apparent facility, so as to render evident the smallest traces of foreign matter. Nothing, not really elementary, was found capable of resisting the test of the Galvanic pile, but one and all were immediately resolved into their elementary forms.

The brilliant prospects which these facts opened to Davy's mind were not long in being pursued. The subject was resumed in 1807, and formed the subject of his Bakerian lectures for that year, "On the Decomposition of the Fixed Alkalies;" for, finding that all *known* compounds were decomposed by electricity, it immediately presented itself as a matter of enquiry to his mind, whether the same energetic power might not separate the elements of bodies hitherto deemed simple. The first substances upon which the trial was made were the fixed alkalies. Caustic potassa was subjected to the action of the voltaic pile, but was found not to conduct electricity in its pure state, and, in its aqueous solution, the water only appeared to suffer decomposition; so that the greatest difficulties occurred; which were not surmounted until after many failures. At length it was discovered that the alkali became a conductor of electricity by being

simply breathed upon ; an effervescence ensued at the positive pole of the battery, and, at the negative pole, small brilliant globules of metallic lustre, like quicksilver, appeared, which burned with explosion, on exposure to air, and reproduced the alkali. In consequence, however, of the extreme proneness of this new substance (*potassium*) to revert to its former state, by attracting oxygen from almost all substances with which it came into contact, its collection and examination presented obstacles of no ordinary kind, although they were finally overcome by employing *naphtha*. *Sodium* was next obtained by the same process, and subsequently the bases of the alkaline earths ; but it is remarkable, that little has been added to our knowledge of these substances by subsequent enquirers, while little has been left to be corrected in the author's own speculations. Batteries, it is true, of an unusually powerful description were employed in these enquiries, amounting, in some instances, to not less than 2000 double plates of four inches square, but these were provided at the suggestion of the author ; and never, perhaps, was chemical investigation carried on, upon the whole, with more clear foresight of the consequences, more consummate ingenuity in overcoming difficulties, or with less intermixture of chance in the results, than the present. By means of the enormous battery above mentioned, platinum placed between the poles of the circuit melted with as much readiness as wax in the flame of a common taper.

"The extreme delight," his brother says, "which he felt when he first saw the metallic basis of potash, can only be conceived by those who are familiar with the operations of the laboratory, and the exciting nature of original research ; who can enter into his previous views, and the analogies by which he was guided, and can comprehend the vast importance of the discovery in its various relations of chemical doctrine ; and, perhaps not least, who can appreciate the workings of a young mind, with an avidity for knowledge and glory commensurate. I have been told by Mr. Edmund Davy, his relative and assistant, now Professor of Chemistry to the Dublin Society, that, when he saw the minute globules of potassium burst through the crust of potash, and take fire as they entered the atmosphere, he could not contain his joy ; he actually danced about the room in extatic delight ; and that some little time was required for him to compose himself sufficiently to continue the experiment."—p. 384.

Some of the leading properties of these newly discovered bodies were so contrary to all that had previously been considered as appertaining to the character of metals, that opposition was immediately raised to their reception among this class of bodies, until the discoverer himself showed that potassium and sodium possessed all the characteristic properties of metals, such as lustre,

opacity, combustibility, the power of forming compounds soluble in acids, the power of conducting electricity, &c.; and that it would be equally logical to exclude arsenic on account of its brittleness, or mercury on account of its fluidity, as potassium and sodium on account of their levity. Definitions, in short, unless received with some allowance, have invariably a tendency to shackle the mind in the investigation of truth. Potassium and platinum, the one lighter than ether, and more fusible than wax, the other the heaviest of all known bodies, and resisting the strongest heats of our furnaces, have yet the same claims to be considered as metals, and are insensibly connected with each other by an intermediate series of gradations. The most remarkable peculiarity of potassium is its levity and the rapid and energetic combustion which it undergoes when placed upon a piece of ice; and such is the extraordinary affinity of this substance for oxygen, that it decomposes the smallest quantities of water contained in alcohol or ether.

Proceeding on the observations of Dr. Maskelyne, that the specific gravity of the whole earth is at least twice as great as that of the known surface; and, therefore, that probably metallic matter is contained in its bowels, and taking it still farther for granted that the eruption of volcanoes is connected with the flowing in of water through subterraneous channels, the author at once sought to apply the facts which he had discovered respecting the metals, to the explanation of these phenomena as well as the phenomena of earthquakes and volcanoes, which he supposed might depend on the sudden fusion and combustion of these substances by the contact of water, and the disruption of the superincumbent strata. With the view of ascertaining how far facts accorded with this view of the subject, he visited, in 1813, the principal extinct volcanoes of the Alps and Pyrennees; and although the result was a considerable modification, or even relinquishment, of his opinions on these points; yet it led to his proving, on the other hand, that most of the basaltic formations in these regions are of igneous origin, so that he was able to trace a regular succession of these formations, from the state of lava into the true prismatic basalt. He also ascertained, at a still later period, that a real jet of flame issued from Mount Vesuvius on the occurrence of an eruption, although this appearance has generally been found to depend on the effect of the rays of light (issuing from the incandescent lava) being reflected from the vesicular vapour which issues from the mouth of the crater along with immense volumes of dust. We may mention, by the way, that Sir Humphry Davy took great delight in the fascinating science of Geology, and contributed many facts towards its elucidation, as well as gave

lectures on the subject. At one time he even projected the plan of a Geological History of Cornwall, which he partly commenced, but laid it aside to pursue more pressing subjects of research. He aided, however, in the formation of the Geological Society of his native country, and contributed one paper to its *Transactions*—the only one on this subject which he ever published.

We have only space briefly to advert to two other important investigations into which Davy entered, and carried on with the most admirable talent and ingenuity. We allude to the subject of tanning, of which he published an account in the Philosophical Transactions for 1803; and the subject of oxymuriatic acid, or chlorine gas, of which he gave an account in the same work in 1809. The '*Transactions*' also contain a great number of his papers on various other subjects of chemistry, which can scarcely be considered as having any interest for the general reader; and which we pass over, therefore, the more willingly that we may come at once to more popular subjects. Before we do this, however, we have an observation to make respecting the disinterestedness of Davy's exertions, and one or two extracts to show the power which he possessed of poetical and vivid description.

In the pursuit of scientific subjects Sir Humphry Davy never lost sight of the ultimate purpose of chemistry, which is to augment the comforts of life, and the advantages of society through the instrumentality of science. Many were the suggestions which his ingenious and prolific understanding threw out for the improvement of the arts; but what we wish to observe is, that personal emolument never formed with him a primary or even secondary object to stimulate his scientific labours. He seems not merely to have known, but to have been blest originally with that disinterestedness of disposition so strongly enforced in the following sentence of Lord Bacon, that "the applying of knowledge to lucre diverts the advancement of knowledge, as the golden ball thrown before Atalanta, which, while she stoops to take up, the race is hindered."

"Declinat cursus, aurumque volubile tollit."

The only profit which he allowed himself to receive from his researches on the extensive and lucrative subject of tanning, was the present of a pair of shoes, which had been tanned with catechu instead of oak bark, which proved on wearing to be of equal quality with the latter. He appears, in short, to have been of opinion that he had done his duty when he had pointed out the application of a scientific truth to the arts of



life; and, alluding in one of his MS. notes to the *trading*, in contradistinction to the *speculative*, alchemists of olden time, he says, "the passions of these men were low, and their purposes vile and inglorious;" whereas, on the contrary, "the true alchemical philosopher had often sublime and elevated views, and the idea of glory continually before his mind."

The following rapturous description of the delights of angling, from the "*Salmonia*," written in illness, during the latter part of the author's life, will find a response in the bosom of every true lover of nature. Angling he says,

"Carries us into the most vivid and beautiful scenery of nature; amongst the mountain lakes, and the clear and lovely streams that gush from the higher ranges of elevated hills, or that make their way through the cavities of calcareous strata. How delightful in the early spring, after the dull and tedious time of winter, when the frost disappears, and the sunshine warms the earth and waters, to wander forth by some clear stream, to see the leaf bursting from the purple bud, to scent the odours of the bank perfumed by the violet, and enamelled, as it were, with the primrose and the daisy; to wander upon the fresh turf below the shade of trees, whose bright blossoms are filled with the music of the bee, and on the surface of the waters to view the gaudy flies sparkling like animated gems in the sunbeams, whilst the bright and beautiful trout is watching them from below; to hear the twittering of the water birds, who, alarmed at your approach, rapidly hide themselves beneath the leaves and flowers of the water-lily; and, as the season advances, to find all these objects change for others of the same kind, but better and brighter, till the swallow and the trout contend, as it were, for the gaudy May-fly; and till, in pursuing your amusement in the calm and balmy evening, you are serenaded by the songs of the cheerful thrush and melodious nightingale performing the offices of paternal love, in thickets ornamented with the rose and woodbine."

In a still later publication, the "*Consolations in Travel*," written during the author's last sad tour, which terminated his valuable life, we find a similar passage, instinct with the true spirit of poetry, and showing how fresh and undiminished his feelings still were, and how completely the energies of his vigorous mind triumphed over the decays of his bodily frame. We are tempted to add this extract, as its sad and sober livery forms a complete contrast to the delightful *allegresse* of the former. Together they form a pair of beautiful sketches, which, considered as the productions of a decayed veteran of science, may be compared to the lowly flowers which are sometimes seen to rear their delicate heads amidst the time-worn rocks of the desert. The scene is the Colosseum at Rome.

"These ruins are highly impressive; yet when I saw them six years ago they had a stronger effect on my imagination: whether it was the

charm of novelty, or that my mind was fresher, or that the circumstances under which I saw them were peculiar, I know not, but probably all these causes operated in affecting my mind. It was a still and beautiful evening in the month of May; the last sunbeams were dying away in the western sky, and the first moonbeams shining in the eastern; the bright orange tints lighted up the ruins, and, as it were, kindled the snows that still remained on the distant Apennines, which were visible from the highest accessible part of the Amphitheatre. In this glow of colouring, the green of advanced spring softened the grey and yellow tints of the decaying stones, and as the lights gradually became fainter, the masses appeared grander and more majestic; and when the twilight had entirely disappeared, the contrast of light and shade in the beams of the full moon, and beneath a sky of the brightest sapphire, but so highly illuminated that only Jupiter and a few stars of the first magnitude were visible, gave a solemnity and magnificence to the scene which awakened the highest degree of that emotion which is so properly termed the sublime. The beauty and permanence of the heavens, and the principle of conservation belonging to the system of the universe, the works of the Eternal and Divine Architect, were finely opposed to the perishing and degraded works of man in his most active and powerful state. And at this moment so humble appeared the condition of the most exalted beings belonging to the earth, so feeble their combinations, so minute the point of space, and so limited the period of time, in which they act, that I could hardly avoid comparing the generations of man, and the effects of his genius and power, to the swarms of luceoli or fire-flies, which were dancing around me, and that appeared flitting and sparkling amidst the gloom and darkness of the ruins, but which were no longer visible when they rose above the horizon—their feeble light being lost and utterly obscured in the brightness of the moonbeams in the heavens."

In 1812, on his marriage to Mrs. Apreece, Sir H. Davy was knighted by the Prince Regent, and in 1818 created a baronet. On the former occasion he resigned the professorship at the Royal Institution, in order that he might have more uninterrupted leisure for the pursuit of original enquiries, and to forward the great objects of science. "I am proud," he says, "of the honour of knighthood, as the greatest of human geniuses bore it; and it is at least a proof that the Court has not overlooked my humble efforts in the cause of science." We are not among the number of those who think that talent, apart from worth of character and those appliances of wealth and external bearing which are necessary to insure popular respect, is alone entitled to the highest honours of the state. A mere literary aristocracy could never command public esteem, not to mention that there is something incongruous, if not contaminating, in the kind of reward, which could not fail to degrade science eventually: still, we think the Court far too backward in general in the encouragement of

scientific and literary merit, and that it might, more frequently than it does, resort to the ranks of science for the reinforcement of a feeble aristocracy. It was this year that the author published his "*Elements of Chemical Philosophy*," in which, although possessing considerable merit, we cannot but perceive the effect of successful talent in relaxing those strenuous efforts after excellence, which are so strongly marked in his "*Bakerian Lectures*." The work was written with precipitate haste, and addressed to Lady Davy; and his publishers, it is said, gave him 1,000 guineas for the copyright; but it never arrived to a second edition: and upon the whole, ought rather to be regarded as an epitome of his own discoveries, than as a regular and systematic compendium of the elements of chemical science.

There is one subject adverted to in these "*Elements*," which deserves consideration, both on account of its importance, as well as on account of the simplicity and order which it indicates in the operations of nature—we allude to the theory of definite proportions, as expounded by Mr. Dalton, of Manchester—viz. that when one substance forms with another more than one compound, the proportion in which it combines to form the second, third, or fourth compound, is always a multiple or divisor of the first; and subordinate to this, that when gases unite, they always combine in equal or multiple volumes. That this fundamental principle was known to former chemists cannot be disputed, but to Mr. Dalton belongs the merit of placing this subject before philosophers in a clear and unequivocal light, although subsequent experience has shown that, in several of its details, it requires considerable modification. It has been intimated by Dr. Paris, that Sir H. Davy was in the habit of insinuating some pleasantries of an incredulous tendency concerning the atoms of Mr. Dalton, but the following extract of an address delivered to the Royal Society, on the award of the first royal medal to Mr. Dalton, effectually removes these impressions.

"Mr. Dalton's permanent reputation will rest upon his having discovered a simple principle, universally applicable to the facts of chemistry—in fixing the proportions in which bodies combine, and thus laying the foundation for future labours respecting the sublime and transcendental parts of the science of corpuscular motion. His merits in this respect resemble those of Kepler in astronomy. The causes of chemical change are as yet unknown, and the laws by which they are governed; but, in connexion with electrical and magnetical phenomena, there is a gleam of light pointing to a new dawn in science; and may we not hope that in another century, chemistry having, as it were, passed under the dominion of the mathematical sciences, may find some happy genius, similar in intellectual powers to the highest and immortal ornament of this Society, capable of unfolding its wonderful and mysterious laws?"

Sir Humphry Davy entered on the enquiry, as to the possibility of devising means for guarding against the explosion of fire damp in mining operations, in 1815, in consequence of several disastrous explosions having taken place, during the preceding years, in some of the northern collieries. Several attempts had previously been made, but none had as yet succeeded in the double object of guarding against explosion, and at the same time illuminating the shaft of the mine. Fire damp, or the explosive gas, consists principally of carburetted hydrogen, mixed in certain proportions with atmospheric air. It is evolved from any fresh broken or pounded coal, and consequently from the coal strata, laying in horizontal beds beneath the surface of the earth, when the superincumbent pressure of the earth is removed, so as to accumulate in the chambers and galleries of the mine in enormous quantities. Occasionally it is permanently evolved from natural fissures in the strata; or extensive air-courses, running several miles in length, are accidentally opened by the picks of the pitmen: and these *blowers*, as they are technically termed, have been known to emit as many as seven hundred hogsheads of fire-damp in a minute, and to continue in a state of activity for months, or even years, together; so that it may easily be conceived how inadequate any system of ventilation must be under such circumstances. Such accumulations of fire damp are most dangerous, and most likely to occur in the deepest mines; but they not unfrequently are met with in those which are more superficial, and especially in old workings. The terrific effects attending their explosion is well described by our author.

“To give detailed accounts,” he says, “of the tremendous accidents owing to this cause, would be merely to multiply pictures of death and human misery. The phenomena are always of the same kind. The miners are either immediately destroyed by the explosion, and thrown with the horses and machinery through the shaft into the air, the mine becoming, as it were, an enormous piece of artillery, from which they are projected; or they are gradually suffocated, and undergo a more painful death, from the carbonic acid and azote remaining in the mine after the inflammation of the fire-damp; or what, though it appears the mildest, is perhaps the most severe fate, they are burnt or maimed, and often rendered incapable of labour, and of healthy enjoyment, for life.”

The discovery of the safety lamp, by which these evils were and are avoided, may truly be said to be a present from philosophy to the arts, as it was the result of patient and enlightened research, in which accident or any second party had no share. The author of the invention began with enquiring into the exact nature of the gaseous substances with which he had to deal,

and into the nature of flame; and ascertaining, after numerous experiments, that *considerable* heat was required for the inflammation of fire-damp; that it produced in burning a comparatively small degree of heat; and that the continuity of the flame was interrupted by metallic tubes; it immediately occurred to him that the explosion might be prevented by the cooling powers of the latter, or that it might be possible to construct a lamp in such manner, that the apertures, through which the air entered, might have the same effect as the tubes in his experiment. This suggestion was prosecuted through a long train of highly ingenious and often dangerous experiments; until, by making successive sections of tubes, and at the same time diminishing their bore, he found that simply perforated plates, or, finally, even wire gauze, was sufficient for the purpose, and that it was perfectly practicable to construct a lamp with gauze sides instead of glass or horn. The attempt, we say, was perfectly successful. Lamps so constructed were immersed in various explosive mixtures, but without inflaming the exterior atmosphere, although within the whole body of the lamp was filled with flame, which afforded light to the workmen; so that here we perceive an almost invisible barrier, consisting of slender net-work or gauze, fully effectual for resisting the effects of the most tremendous and irresistible power, and art and science triumphing over the most formidable obstacles of nature. These various researches were communicated to the Royal Society in five successive papers, from 1815 to 1817; but the author's original discovery was completed within four months, from August to December of the first year;—the subsequent papers referring chiefly to the nature of flame and the combustion of other gases. The merit of this discovery was speedily acknowledged by several handsome presents and public testimonials to the inventor, although, as in most other instances, attempts were not wanting to deprive him of the honour of the invention—attempts which, we regret to observe, have been partly countenanced by a Committee of the House of Commons. Similar attempts, however, have recently been made to rob the illustrious Newton of his glory, and Jenner of his civic crown; but the public is too just to listen to the malignant croakings of ill-nature, or the interested claims of ignorance, and therefore we do not deem it necessary to enter into any formal vindication of Sir Humphry Davy.

In politics Sir Humphry Davy was liberal and enlightened, without taking, however, any decided part in public measures, or joining any given section of the community. His opinions on Ireland and the Irish were drawn from immediate observation of the people, and carry the marks of his usual good sense.

“I have very much to say about Ireland. *It is an island which*

*might be made a new and a great Country!* It now boasts a fertile soil, an ingenious and robust peasantry, and a rich aristocracy; but the bane of the nation is the equality of poverty amongst the lower orders. All are *slaves*, without the probability of becoming free; they are in the state of equality which the *sans-culottes* wished for in France; and until emulation and riches, and the love of clothes and neat houses, are introduced amongst them, there will be no permanent improvement.

“Changes in political institutions can, at first, do little towards serving them. It must be by altering their habits, by diffusing manufactures, by destroying *middle-men*, by dividing farms, and by promoting industry by making the pay proportional to the work.”

And in another place he observes—

“The great vice of the people is want of perseverance: nothing is finished; they begin grandly and magnificently, but complete very little. In mining, they build machinery before they have discovered a vein; in fisheries, they erect their cellars before they have purchased nets; and they build magnificent stables, which they intend for their studs, but which they are themselves obliged to inhabit. *Foresight and prudence are unknown.*”

Sanguine expectations were at one time entertained that the catalogue of Greek and Roman classics would be greatly enriched by the discovery of new treasures among the ruins of Herculaneum; and under the auspices of Mr. Hayter, who, with the consent of the Neapolitan Government, was despatched to Italy for this purpose, a complete treatise of Polidorus, on the subject of music, was successfully deciphered. The process employed was the substitution of false backs of gold-beater's skin, by bit and bit, as the unrolling was performed, by which the brittle and carbonized papyri were rendered flexible. A facsimile was then made of the MS. by a draftsman unacquainted with the language, and, finally, it was transferred to the antiquarian to decipher. The great expense and difficulty, however, of this process, and the little success which had attended it, rendered some more easy means a great desideratum; and accordingly Sir Humphry Davy, when he visited Italy in 1818, directed his attention to the subject. He found, contrary to general opinion, that the carbonization of the manuscript was the effect of slow decomposition, and not the effect of fire; and consequently the means which he suggested, viz. chlorine and ether, were such as possessed the power of decomposing, or at least dissolving, the bituminous matter by which the leaves were agglutinated together. The plan was perfectly successful; but in consequence of the unworthy jealousy of the curators of the museum, and the injured state of the manuscripts themselves, the result, upon the whole, has rather proved interesting to chemistry than to the

cause of classical literature. On his return on the 30th of November, 1819, he was elected to the highest scientific dignity in this country—which is to fill the chair of the Royal Society.

The last of Sir H. Davy's scientific labours which we shall notice, is the method of preventing the corrosion of copper sheeting by sea-water. These labours were commenced in 1823, and finished in 1826, and the results were communicated in four successive papers to the "Philosophical Transactions." It adds greatly to the merit of this, as it did also to the author's previous discovery of the safety-lamp, that each was the fruit of a prescribed task,—the first by the Lords Commissioners of the Navy, and the latter by the Rev. Dr. Gray; both were the result of elaborate and judicious experiments, and both equally fulfilled the objects for which they were designed. Formerly it was supposed, that the corrosion of copper by sea-water depended on some impurity of the metal, or some imperfection in its manufacture; but Sir H. Davy showed, that the purest copper was liable to this effect, which depended on the electricity of the metal being different from that of the oxygen or acid with which it was combined. It was, in fact, weakly positive, and, agreeably to a general law, became readily oxidizable under such circumstances; but that, when united to one-fortieth to one hundred and fiftieth part of zinc, or iron surface, it became then relatively negative, and completely protected from the influence in question. It unfortunately turns out, however, that the same negative power which protects the copper from corroding and oxidizing agencies, renders it in the same degree attractive of electropositive bodies, and therefore of the earthy substances contained in sea-water, which, becoming deposited on a large scale on the bottom of the vessel, form an adventitious surface, in the highest degree favourable for the attachment of weeds and marine animals, so that on some occasions the bottoms of vessels have been found in so extremely foul a condition, and the sailing so much impeded in consequence, that the attainment of port has been rendered almost impracticable. As on other occasions, however, so on this, the plan, deemed to have failed in the hands of the original inventor, is likely now to turn out a successful speculation, and a patent has lately, we understand, been taken out for covering ship's bottoms with *iron-plate* protected by zinc—the iron, besides its cheapness, not being liable to the inconveniences above-mentioned; thus confirming the truth of a remark made by the author himself on another occasion, that "It is in the nature of physical science, that its methods offer only approximations to truth; and the first and most glorious inventors are often left behind by very inferior minds, in the minutiae of manipulation; and their errors enable others to discover truth."

But it is time that we turn to other scenes, more interesting still than those in which we have hitherto viewed Sir H. Davy. It must be, indeed, pleasing to every Christian mind to learn, that he, who, by his profound and extensive knowledge of nature's most hidden works, had become an ornament to his country and a blessing to the human race, had not forgotten the God from whom all nature sprung. For it is a lamentable truth, that many, who, like Sir Humphry, have become eminent in medical and philosophical science, and who have thus been able to contemplate more nearly than other men the wonders of the power, and goodness, and wisdom of the Great Creator, have not learned to adore and praise him, but have ventured to deny his existence, or to attribute the most magnificent of his visible works to chance. At every step, Sir Humphry saw and confessed the presence of a creating and all-ruling Providence.

"In every thing belonging to the economy of nature," he says, "I find new reasons for wondering at the designs of Providence—at the infinite intelligence by which so many complicated effects are produced by most simple causes. The precipitation of water from the atmosphere, its rapid motion in rivers, and its falls in cataracts, not only preserve this element pure, but give it its vitality, and render it subservient even to the embryo life of fish. . . . So that the perturbation and motion of the winds and waves possess a use, and ought to impress us with a beauty higher and more beautiful even than that of the peaceful and glorious calm."\*

Great as were the acquirements of his mind, and much as he must have admired the developement of genius and the results of deep study in other men, he declares that he considers a firm faith in the doctrines of Christianity more highly to be prized than any other ornament of the human mind. In the work above quoted, the sentiments of "Physicus" on this subject, which may be received as those of the author, are thus expressed :

"I envy no quality of the mind or intellect in others ; be it genius, power, wit, or fancy ; but if I could choose what would be most *delightful*, and I believe most *useful*, to me, I should prefer a firm religious belief to every other blessing : for it makes life a discipline of goodness, creates new hopes when all earthly hopes vanish ; and throws over the decay, the destruction of existence, the most gorgeous of all lights ; awakens life even in death, and from corruption and decay calls up beauty and divinity ; makes an instrument of torture and of shame, the ladder of ascent to Paradise ; and, far above all combinations of earthly hopes, calls up the most delightful visions of palms and amaranths, the gardens of the blest, the security of everlasting joys, where the sensualist and the sceptic view only gloom, decay, annihilation, and despair."

---

\* "Salmonia," p. 86.



But those, who have read the two works to which we have alluded, must have wondered at the very favourable, we must say beautiful, light in which several of the doctrines and points of discipline peculiar to the Catholic Church are presented to them. The world has not been told the cause of this. Dr. John Davy, in the memoirs of his brother's life, somewhere says, that Sir Humphry selected his principal speakers on the subject of religion (and to whom he generally gave the palm of victory in the controversial dialogues) from the Catholic Church, because that Church has always exacted from its followers an uniformity and stability of belief in its articles of faith; and we do not know that Dr. Davy could have passed a higher encomium on those sacred ministers of religion who consider themselves the successors of the apostles, who received from their Divine Master the command to teach to all nations the faith that he had taught to them, and which must be as immutable as He who brought it down upon the earth. Sir Humphry could not, therefore, have found a more powerful reason for the manner in which he has expressed himself in favour of the tenets of the Catholic faith. But it was not this mere abstract idea alone, that influenced his mind on this point; and we shall, before we conclude this article, perhaps reveal more than his biographer knew—certainly more than he has narrated. We will now extract, from the more important of the two works before us, "*Consolations in Travel, or the Last Days of a Philosopher*," some of the ideas on religious subjects, which are scattered throughout, that our readers may learn what were the opinions of our great philosopher, during *his* last days, and what true *Consolations* he derived from his travels.

The work is composed of a series of six dialogues upon different and important subjects. The interlocutors in the first dialogue are Philalethes—a name worthy of him who bore it, for it is under this name that Sir Humphry expresses his own sentiments. Ambrosio and Onuphio, two distinguished Britons, with whom Philalethes had formed an intimacy during his residence in Rome. Ambrosio is a man of highly cultivated taste, of extensive historical and classical knowledge, and in religion a Catholic. Onuphrio is also possessed of great learning, but his opinions are of that kind which we too frequently meet with in English gentlemen, whose education has not been guided by religion. He admits little that his own reason cannot teach him; he seems indifferent to every form of faith, and advances in many of his sentiments almost to the verge of scepticism. The different opinions, however, of both Philalethes and of Onuphrio seem to be stated only that they may be confuted by the Catholic

Ambrosio. The scene of their conversation opens on a spot where all their enthusiasm, classical and religious, might well burst forth. It is in the Colosseum, which, "for the hundredth time even," may be viewed with new admiration. The place and the time—the evening, when the pious followers of the cross were paying their adorations to their Saviour at the different stations at which the stages of his passion are represented within its vast area—naturally drew from Ambrosio reflections upon the triumph of that religion, which had endured its most bloody conflicts upon that spot, but which now had raised, at a short distance from them, a temple in honour of one of its persecuted ministers more glorious than any that had been erected to receive the adorations of the Pagan deities. Prophecies had been verified in the establishment of that religion, and miracles had been wrought to extend and to confirm it; there would, therefore, be no apprehension of what Onuphrio expresses, even if the magnificent dome of St. Peter's may hereafter be in a similar state to that in which the Colosseum now is, that "its ruins may be preserved by the sanctifying influence of some new and unknown faith." We cannot wonder that Onuphrio should thus express himself, for like all who have imbibed an indifference for religion, who consult their own limited understandings, and not the eternal decrees of Omnipotence, he thinks that the history of religion is like to the "general history of all the works and institutions belonging to humanity." He would reverence religion "in the followers of Brahmah, in the discipline of Mahomet, and can wonder at it in all the variety of forms which it adopts in the Christian world." It is pleasing to us to observe, that the author permits the Catholic speaker to answer these, certainly not religious, opinions, by pointing to the history of the world, to the rise and fall of empires, to the destinies of the Jewish dispensation, as so many preparations for the promulgation and "final establishment of a creed fitted for the most enlightened state of the human mind, and equally adapted to every climate and every people." When Ambrosio and Onuphrio withdraw into the city, Philaethes is left alone, at a moment when a less enthusiastic mind than his would have risen almost to a state of ecstasy; when the moon was floating above him, and the majestic ruins, amidst which he sits, in a flood of intense splendour. The reveries in which he indulges, in the company of spectres of the ancient Romans, pass into visions, by the aid of which he is borne away to the first ages of the world and of the human race. He sees man, but he contemplates him without the light of revelation; he sees him struggling against the desolation of his savage state upon the earth, guided in his search for temporal happiness only

by his own weak reason. Societies are formed, kingdoms and empires are established, laws are framed for their preservation; the arts are cultivated, but still by man, unaided by inspiration from on high. From the earth, our philosopher passes into a cometary system, where he finds beings of a nature superior to those who dwell upon the earth, which he had forsaken in company with the genius of his dreams—beings that rise or descend in the degrees of their perfection according to the use to which they have applied the powers which have been imparted to them.

Such were the wanderings of the philosopher, in which Philalethes most probably intended to pourtray the wild fancies of those, who, scorning the guides which religion presents to them, lose their understanding, and with it a belief in all revelation. We will follow our friends from Rome to the summit of Vesuvius, and will there listen to their discussions on the vision.

After having listened to the narration of Philalethes, Ambrosio, our Catholic friend, remarks, that the vision “is not only incompatible with revelation, but likewise with reason and every thing that we know respecting the history or traditions of the early nations of antiquity.” (p. 68.) The Catholic is taught to revere the sacred scriptures, and to prefer the narratives therein contained to all the specious systems of a wild philosophy, and to all the fables, how numerous soever and widely extended they may be, that have come down to us from the pagan nations of antiquity. If we examine the inspired records, we shall find, in every page, that there was a light from on high to direct man’s steps through life—that from the beginning of the world his mind was assisted by a Divine revelation, which taught him the duties which he owed to his Creator and to his fellow-man. This light was, we know, almost extinguished, and this revelation was obscured, in many of the nations of the earth—and hence that state of barbarism in some, hence in others, who arrived at a degree of civilization in society, that corruption of all morality, and those frightful and confused ideas of religion, which the history of the pagan world presents. It is thus that Ambrosio would argue with Onuphrio, who, following his boasted reason, is not sure that the religion of the Jews was superior to that of the Sabæans, who worshipped the stars, or to that of the ancient Persians who adored the sun, as the visible symbols of divine power; and who would, like the ancient Romans, give a place in his Pantheon to all the gods. And here we must pause to find fault with some of the opinions expressed by Ambrosio; for although from the tone of the whole book, we must suppose that the judgment of Sir Humphry Davy was highly in favour of the doctrines of the Catholic Church, yet we must not be

surprised, even when his Catholic *dramatis personæ* speak, to hear sometimes opinions in which Catholics cannot concur. To account for the mode in which revelations were conveyed to the patriarchs of old, he supposes, (p. 80) that their ideas were so modified that, on many occasions, they imagined that they enjoyed the actual presence of the Divinity, and heard his voice; but as religious instinct probably becomes feebler in their posterity, the vividness of the impressions ceased, and they became visions or dreams, which, with the prophets, seem to have constituted inspiration. Now, unless we destroy the literal and evident meaning of innumerable passages of the divine writings, we must reject these opinions of Ambrosio. For how can it be said, that those parts of scripture which tell us that the Lord spoke to man, are not to be interpreted in that sense which their words seem so clearly to signify? Can it be asserted, that the conversation which is said to have taken place between our first parents and their Creator, was no more than the voice of remorse speaking to their troubled conscience; if not, then the Lord must have spoken. The same must be said of the words of the Lord to Cain, after the murder of his innocent brother. To whom did the murderer say, that he was not his brother's keeper? Certainly to him who asked him, "Where is thy brother Abel?" That the voice of the Lord was heard many ages after the time when it is said no more to have spoken to men, is evident from the books of the New Testament. When our Redeemer had come from the waters of the Jordan, a voice was heard in Heaven, "This is my beloved son;" and the same words were repeated amidst the glories of his transfiguration on Mount Thabor. Again; it is, indeed, certain that God can—for he has often done so—convey his inspirations to men, by visions or dreams; but it is also as certain, that the inspiration which was poured upon the prophets, came to them by other means; we have only to read their writings to convince ourselves of this truth. But we are more inclined to quarrel with our friend for his opinions respecting the miraculous cures of the demoniacs recorded by the evangelists.

"The Divine intelligence chooses, that men should be convinced according to the ordinary train of their sensations.\*\*\* The popular opinion of the people of Judea was, that certain diseases were occasioned by devils taking possession of a human being; the disease was cured by our Saviour, and this, in the gospel, is expressed by his casting out devils."—p. 81.

The evangelical writers, when speaking of those persons, whom we call demoniacs, express themselves in such terms, that it is manifest that *they* understood them to be persons really in-

festes by evil spirits. "They presented to him all sick people, that were taken with diverse diseases and torments, and *such as were possessed by devils*, and he cured them."\* In this text, it is evident, that St. Matthew distinguishes the sick and the infirm from those who were possessed by evil demons, all of which were cast out by the power of our Redeemer. The words addressed by our Lord to the spirit that revealed its name—Legion, cannot have been spoken to a disease of the body with which the possessed man was afflicted. We might adduce the instances of the devils which are said to have been dumb; of those which exclaimed—"What have we to do with thee, Jesus of Nazareth;"—and of those that were permitted (at their own request) to enter into the herd of swine; to prove that the assertions of Ambrosio cannot be sustained. If we were to maintain these opinions; were we to say, that the idea of demoniacs was nought else than a fiction of Jewish superstition; we should be obliged to admit, as a consequence, (blasphemous as it would be)—that our Saviour led into error, not only those of his followers who were contemporary with him upon earth, but also every succeeding generation. For his manner of acting on all occasions, where those "having devils" were presented to him, and his defence of the power by which he wrought these wonders,—by the finger of God, and not by Beelzebub,—show that the devil was really in possession of the bodies of those, from whom the sacred writers state that evil spirits were expelled. These opinions savour much of those dangerous ideas of rationalism with which the works of so many modern commentators upon the Holy Scriptures abound,—men who seem to imagine, that a spirit of rashness, and a store of profane learning, are sufficient to guide them into the most hidden recesses of the word of God. We would have wished that Ambrosio had been more explicit in his replies concerning the incarnation and death of our Redeemer. The idea of an integrant part of the essence of God animating a human form, may be philosophical; it hardly expresses the sublime idea which revelation imparts of the second person of the adorable Trinity taking to itself our human nature. He should have told his opponent, that it was not the Godhead that suffered the cruel torments of the cross, and that, therefore, there is nothing repugnant to reason in all that the inspired historians narrate of the sufferings of the son of God. Philaethes, who had been the cause, and who had remained a silent listener of the discussion, at length acknowledges, that the reasonings of his Catholic companion compel him to break down the fanciful

---

\* Matthew iv, 24.

fabric of his dreams, to substitute religion for reason, and faith for what he had called instinct in man. The conversation had made the sceptic Onuphrio a Philo-Christian, and taught him to confess, that the faith of his friend was far better fitted to act as a means of contemplating the great truths relating to God and to man, than "the smoked or coloured glasses of scepticism."

We have now arrived at the most beautiful and most interesting portion of the "Consolations in Travel;" that portion which forms the third dialogue. The travellers had journeyed onwards to the magnificent temples of Pæstum; and, speaking of the plain upon which these vast piles of antiquity stand, our author says,—“Were my existence to be prolonged through ten centuries, I think I could never forget the pleasure I received on that delicious spot.” (p. 102.) But our subject is not now temples or cities, Greek, Roman, or Saracen, that have left to us scarcely one visible trace of their existence. We will introduce to our readers a most interesting individual, with whom the travellers here became accidentally acquainted. It is well known that Sir Humphry Davy threw around the history of this person many of the adventures of his own life, and that he has expressed, in the words of the stranger, many of his own sentiments; and, although the character of Philalethes be still preserved, it is only to demonstrate how the opinions of the philosopher were converted into those of the Christian, and how nearly the latter came into harmony with those of Ambrosio. But the scene in which the Unknown first appears is too beautiful not to be repeated:—

“My companions began to employ themselves in measuring the circumference of one of the Doric columns, when they suddenly called my attention to a stranger who was sitting on a camp-stool behind it. The appearance of any person in this place, at this time, was sufficiently remarkable; but the man who was before us, from his dress and appearance, would have been remarkable anywhere. He was employed in writing in a memorandum-book, when we first saw him; but he immediately arose and saluted us, by bending the head slightly though gracefully; and this enabled me to see distinctly his person and dress.... When he spoke to our guide, I thought I had never heard a more agreeable voice,—sonorous, yet gentle and silver-sounded. His dress was very peculiar, almost like that of an ecclesiastic, but coarse and light; a large soiled white hat, on which was fastened a pilgrim’s cockle-shell, lay beside him on the ground; and, attached to a rosary of coarse beads, suspended from his neck, was a long, antique, blue-enamelled phial, like those found in the Greek tombs. He took up his hat, and appeared to be retiring to another part of the building, when I apologized for the interruption we had given to his studies, begged him to resume them,

and assured him that our stay in the building would be only momentary, for I saw that there was a cloud over the sun, the brightness of which was the cause of our retiring. I spoke to him in Italian; he replied in English, observing, that he supposed the fear of contracting the malaria fever had induced us to seek the shelter of the shade."

The first words of this conversation reveal to us Sir Humphry Davy beneath the romantic disguise of the Unknown. They relate to the powers of chlorine in repelling the attacks of the malaria; and the discoveries of Sir Humphry relative to this substance are known to the whole scientific world. The nature of the materials which form the mighty temples of Pæstum leads the stranger into a long dissertation on the formation of the travestine, and to a narration of the many observations that he had made on the Campagna di Roma, the accuracy of which can be immediately attested by those who have trodden on that sacred ground. This subject imperceptibly leads to another, closely connected with it,—the formation of our earth into its present state. The Unknown adopts the system of those geologists who argue, from the appearances of our globe in its inner parts, that it underwent many and violent revolutions before it arrived at that state in which it was fitted to receive man as an inhabitant. The remains of vast and now unknown animals that are scattered through the bowels of the earth, like the mighty ruins of great cities upon its surface, seem to speak to mankind of times gone by, when the whole globe was as different from that which we now behold it, as the barbarian of Africa or of Asia must consider the condition of those ancient kingdoms, whose cities are scattered beneath his feet, to have been different from that which they have assumed since he became their master. "The megalosauri, with paddles instead of legs, and clothed in mail, in size equal or superior to the whale, and the great amphibia, plethiosauri, with bodies like turtles, but furnished with necks longer than their bodies," certainly argue an order of nature far removed from that which now surrounds us. He supposes, therefore, that the days of creation are epochæ, or indefinite periods, during which this state of things, that has now passed away, existed. This may be deemed a philosophical romance, as it is called by Ambrosio; but it is one that has attracted much of the attention of the most learned and most intellectual scholars of our age; some of whom, as the late Baron Cuvier, advanced so far in this department of modern science as to erect once more, in their vast and original forms, those monsters of other days, from the scattered ruins that have been dug from the earth. We will say, with Ambrosio, that in this system there is nothing contrary to the records of sacred Scripture; but we feel tempted also to say, with an inspired writer, that

God created the heavens and the earth, and then delivered them to the disputations of men. The account of the genesis of the world which is recorded by Moses, is of the simplest kind, and was designed to teach those for whom it was written that this earth and all creation owe their existence to the word of Him who pronounced the mighty *fiat*; but though general and simple, the truths that are contained in this narration are divine truths, with which no systems of geology, how beautiful or specious soever, may combat. But those who revere revelation have this consolation, if they need it, that the farther and the more rapidly this science advances, the history of the sacred book becomes more evident and more confirmed; confounding the impious theories of those who would endeavour to prove, from the state of our earth, that we claim in vain for the writings of Moses the high and holy privilege of inspiration.

"It must be gratifying," says Dr. Wiseman, "thus to see a science, formerly classed, and not, perhaps, unjustly, among the most pernicious to faith, once more become her handmaid; to see her now, after so many years' wandering from theory to theory, or rather from vision to vision, return once more to her home, where she was born, and to the altar at which she made her first simple offerings; no longer, as when she went forth, a wilful, dreamy, empty-handed child, but with a matronly dignity and a priest-like step, and a bosom full of well-earned gifts, to pile upon its sacred hearth."\*

The philosophy of the Unknown, and the religion of Ambrosio, overcome the scepticism of Onuphrio; the *vision* and the remarks of Ambrosio upon it are related for the entertainment of the stranger, who agrees in all the opinions of Ambrosio, and declares that such considerations had in his youth freed him from the entangled mazes of incredulity. He is not, however, a Catholic, as Ambrosio had thought, but belongs "to the Church of Christ." This is the religion which Dr. Davy assigns to his brother, than which it would be difficult to imagine one more undefined, or more depending on the caprice of man. For that which Sir Humphry may have considered as essential to the creed of those who belong to the Church of Christ, his brother may deem unnecessary, while a third may think it destructive of Christianity. How different are the members of that Church which stands upon the rock immovable, and in whom are required an "*uniformity*" and a "stability of faith." This assertion excited surprise in the minds of the travellers, while they gaze upon the appearance of the stranger. He frees them from their doubts by the following beautiful narration:—

"The rosary which you see suspended around my neck is a memorial

---

\* Lectures on Science and Revealed Religion, vol. i. p. 321.



of sympathy and respect for an illustrious man. I was passing through France in the reign of Napoleon, by the peculiar privilege granted to a *savant*, on my road to Italy. I had just returned from the Holy Land, and had in my possession two or three of the rosaries which are sold to pilgrims at Jerusalem, as having been suspended in the Holy Sepulchre. Pius VII was then in imprisonment at Fontainebleau. By a special favour, on the plea of my return from the Holy Land, I obtained permission to see this venerable and illustrious pontiff. I carried with me one of my rosaries. He received me with great kindness. I tendered my services to execute any commissions, not political ones, he might think fit to intrust me with, in Italy, informing him that I was an Englishman: he expressed his thanks, but declined troubling me. I told him I was just returned from the Holy Land, and, bowing with great humility, offered to him my rosary from the Holy Sepulchre; he received it with a smile, touched it with his lips, gave his benediction over it, and returned it into my hands, supposing, of course, that I was a Roman Catholic. I had meant to present it to his holiness; but the blessing he had bestowed upon it, and the touch of his lips, made it a precious relic to me; and I restored it to my neck, round which it has ever since been suspended. . . . 'We shall meet again, adieu:' and he gave me his paternal blessing.

"It was eighteen months after this interview, that I went out, with almost the whole population of Rome, to receive and welcome the triumphal entry of this illustrious father of the Church into his capital. He was borne on the shoulders of the most distinguished artists, headed by Canova: and never shall I forget the enthusiasm with which he was received—it is impossible to describe the shouts of triumph and of rapture sent up to Heaven by every voice. And when he gave his benediction to the people, there was a universal prostration, a sobbing and marks of emotion and joy, almost like the bursting of the heart. I heard every where around me cries of 'The holy Father, the most holy Father; his restoration is the work of God!' I saw tears streaming from the eyes of almost all the women about me, many of whom were sobbing hysterically, and old men were weeping as if they were children. I pressed my rosary to my breast on this occasion, and repeatedly touched with my lips that part of it which had received the kiss of the most venerable pontiff. I preserve it with a kind of hallowed feeling, as the memorial of a man whose sanctity, firmness, meekness, and benevolence, are an honour to his Church and to human nature: and it has not only been useful to me, by its influence on my own mind, but it has enabled me to give pleasure to others, and has, I believe, been sometimes *beneficial in ensuring my personal safety*. I have often gratified the peasants of Apulia and Calabria, by presenting them to kiss, a rosary from the holy sepulchre, which had been hallowed by the touch of the lips and benediction of the Pope: and it has been even respected by, and procured me a safe passage through, a party of brigands, who once stopped me in the passes of the Apennines."—p. 150.

The day to which the Unknown here alludes, is still a day of joyful remembrance to the Romans, to which they revert with a

loyal and religious enthusiasm. Dr. Davy says that it is not probable that Sir Humphry ever had an interview with Pius VII at Fontainebleau, and that it was not until the return of the pontiff, whose sanctity, firmness, meekness, and benevolence, were an honour to his Church and human nature, that Sir Humphry had an opportunity of paying his respects to him. However that may be, and the circumstance is not important, it is certain that the acquaintance which he formed with Catholics during "his last days" in Rome, produced a most powerful influence on his mind. Dr. Davy has recorded many of his brother's early religious sentiments; and we have only to compare them with opinions seriously expressed in the two works, which we have had under consideration, to perceive the change which his mind had undergone. He every where speaks of the particular doctrines and discipline of Catholics with the greatest respect.

"'Nay, Halicus,' says our Catholic fisherman, in the *Salmonia* (155), 'call them not bad neighbours: recollect my creed, and respect at least what, if error, was the error of the western Christian world for 1,000 years' (before the Reformation, consequently coeval with the introduction of Christianity into our island). 'The rigid observance of the seventh day appears to me rather a part of the Mosaic than of the Christian dispensation.'"

A curious anecdote is then related of an Irish Protestant, who in his zeal for the due observance of the precept, "Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day," forgot those other two commandments, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," and "Thou shalt not steal;" and of a Scot who interrupted the innocent experiments of some learned men, saying, "Ye think ye are only stane breakers; but I ken ye are Sabbath breakers, and deserve to be staned by your ain stanes!"

In a letter dated Rome, Dec. 21, 1828, written to his brother, Sir Humphry thus expresses himself:— •

"Monsignor Spada is my chief companion here. That most amiable man desires to be most kindly remembered to you. Morichini and the professors of the Sapienza do all they can to assist me in my electrical experiments."

Dr. John Davy may perhaps not know what was the subject of conversation between his brother and the amiable Monsignor Spada. It was our fortune, during a residence in Rome, at the same time that Sir Humphry Davy was in that city, when he was "wearing away the winter, and was a ruin amongst ruins," to form a personal acquaintance with Monsignor Spada, and from him we learnt that his conversations with Sir Humphry Davy were chiefly of a religious nature; that Sir Humphry was most anxious to be fully instructed in all the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church; and that he expressed his determination, should the

result of his enquiries answer his expectation, finally to embrace a religion, for the chief pastor of which he has expressed such unequivocal respect and veneration. He left Rome, but with the resolution of returning the following winter to Italy, and it had been previously arranged that he should retire to a villa near Macerata, the native place of M. Spada, to surrender himself with him to the exclusive study of religion. Upon the minds of those who were acquainted with his intentions, there was not the slightest doubt of what would have been the termination of these sacred studies. It has been asserted, although Dr. Davy does not mention the fact, that previously to his death, Sir Humphry was actually admitted into the bosom of the Catholic Church. The profound knowledge, and amiable character of Sir Humphry Davy, won for him the respect and love of many among the Romans. Professor Morichini, whose death has lately been announced, was his particular friend. To him he left his chemical apparatus, which is now in the museum of the Sapienza, and over it a beautiful marble bust, placed there by Morichini, as a tribute to departed science and friendship. The name of Sir Humphry Davy is another name to be added to the long catalogue of those who, within our own recollection, have risen to eminence in literature and science, and who, from that bright height, have looked upon the Catholic Church, and have been struck with her beauty, and charmed with her loveliness. They had, perhaps, placed no curb upon their imaginations before, and, following their own perverted reason as their only guide, had wandered far from the temple of religion into the dark and cold regions of infidelity. But when they have heard another voice, they have confessed, that—

“Religion, whether natural or revealed, has always the same beneficial influence on the mind. In youth, in health, and prosperity, it awakens feelings of gratitude and sublime love, and purifies at the same time that it exalts: but it is in misfortune, in sickness, in age, that its effects are most truly and beneficially felt, when submission in faith, and humble trust in the Divine will, from duties become pleasures—undecaying sources of consolation: then it creates powers which were believed to be extinct, and gives a freshness to the mind which was supposed to have passed away for ever.”\*

We conclude with expressing our hope that Dr. Davy, after having evinced so much amiable feeling for his brother's character, will not leave the work unaccomplished, but will gratify the public by a complete collection of his writings: which, as models of bold and sagacious reasoning, will form a monument to his fame far more durable than brass or marble, or the loftiest panegyrics of his friends.

ART. IX.—*A new Version of the Four Gospels, with Notes, Critical and Explanatory.* By a Catholic. London. 1836.

THE appearance of any work upon biblical literature is, unfortunately, a phenomenon amongst us. Whether this branch of theological science be cultivated as it deserves by the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, it might be deemed presumption in us to discuss; but of the manifestation, by its fruits, of such a study, we cannot avoid being cognizant. What is done in the seclusion of academical life, in the cloisters of our religious establishments, or in the rural solitude of our clergy, may be much more than falls under the public notice; the appearance of a work like the one that heads this article, shows that considerable abilities are, in secret, employed upon biblical pursuits, and must check the hasty conclusion, that little is done because little appears. At the same time, the sudden and unannounced publication of a new version of scripture was not the earliest indication which we should have expected of increased attention to these studies. We are utterly unprovided with even elementary and introductory works upon them, whether intended for the education of our clergy, or the instruction of our people; we possess not a commentary suited to the wants of the times, or the advances made in biblical science; and are obliged to seek information either in voluminous, rare, and old writers, or in the productions of men whose religion differs essentially from ours. And even in this last resource, we have but scanty measure of relief. Protestant England is almost as badly provided as ourselves with works of practical usefulness; and it would seem as though water were as bad a conductor of knowledge as it is of electricity; for the narrow strip which girds our islands most effectually precludes all communication of the various and interesting researches which occupy the Continent.

But the indication of attention to biblical learning, which we should most confidently have expected to find preceding any new version of scripture; and we will add, the proof of its existence which is most imperatively called for, is a revision and correction of that version now in use among Catholics, known by the name of the *Douay version*. We do not imagine, that the learned author of the new translation for a moment imagined or intended, that it should supersede the one now in general circulation. The sanctioned authenticity of the Vulgate, its use in all Catholic churches, the hold which it has upon the memory of clergy and laity, then the confined and partial nature of the new

version, which comprises only the gospels, and the form in which it appears; are sufficient proofs that he never entertained the idea. The correspondence between St. Jerom and St. Augustine upon the difficulties encountered in introducing the translation of the former, instead of the old one made from the Septuagint, shows how little practicable such substitutions are. We make these remarks only to conclude, that whatever necessity existed, before the appearance of this version, for a thorough revision of the text generally used amongst us, the same necessity does still exist. While, therefore, we are ready to commend the zeal and ability which have led to this publication, we cannot but regret that no one properly qualified, and properly authorised, has yet been found to undertake such corrections and improvements in our received version, as would finally settle its text, and save it from the repeated liberty which has been taken with it.

To call it any longer the Douay or Rhemish version is an abuse of terms. It has been altered and modified till scarce any verse remains as it was originally published; and so far as simplicity and energy of style are concerned, the changes are in general for the worse. For though Dr. Challoner did well to alter many too decided Latinisms, which the old translators retained, he weakened the language considerably by destroying inversion, where it was congenial at once to the genius of our language and the construction of the original, and by the insertion of particles where they were by no means necessary. Any chapter of the New Testament will prove this remark. For instance, in Heb. xiii. which we have accidentally opened, the Rhemes edition (1582) has, v. 9, "With various and strange doctrines be not led away." This has been altered into "Be not carried away with various and strange doctrines." The Latin is, "Doctrinis variis et peregrinis nolite abduci." Again, v. 16, "Beneficence and communication do not forget," has been changed into "and do not forget to do good and to impart." The vulgate has, "Beneficentiæ autem et communionis nolite oblivisci." Again, we take examples quite at random, 2 Tim. ii. 16, "Profana autem et vaniloquia devita; multum enim proficiunt ad impietatem." This the old version translated, "But profane and vain speeches avoid; for they do much grow to impiety." In the emended edition (1750) we have, "But shun profane and vain babblings, for they grow much towards ungodliness." This correction is taken verbatim from the Protestant version, with the exception of "grow towards," instead of "increase unto more." But the change was injudicious; for the Latin compound *vaniloquium*, or the Greek *κεροφωνία*, is exactly expressed by "vain speech," whereas the word "babbling" corresponds to the entire word, and

cannot have the epithet "vain;" for, thus, the phrase would represent the absurd tautology "vanum vaniloquium." In later editions, as that of Dublin, 1810, published with Dr. Troy's approbation, the word "speeches" is restored, but the construction is not.

There is another alteration of more importance, especially when considered in reference to the present times, and the influence it has had upon established forms of Catholic speech. In the first edition, in conformity to Catholic usage in England, the word "Dominus" is almost always translated by "*Our Lord*." The emended text changed the pronoun into an article, and says, "*The Lord*." In the *Ave Maria*, Catholics have always, till lately, been accustomed to say, "*Our Lord* is with thee;" as it is in that version, and was always used in England, even before it was made. But, in conformity with the change of the text, we have observed of late a tendency to introduce a similar variation, and say, "*The Lord* is with thee:" a change which we strongly deprecate, as stiff, *cantish*, destructive of the unction which the prayer breathes, and of that union which the pronoun inspires between the reciter and Her who is addressed. We have no hesitation in saying, that this difference, trifling as many will consider it, expresses strongly the different spirits of our and other religions. It never has been the custom of the Catholic Church to say, "*The Redeemer, the Saviour, the Lord, the Virgin*;" "*Redemptor noster, Dominus noster*," and so "*our Saviour, our Lord, our Lady*," are the terms sanctioned; and, therefore, consecrated by Catholic usage since the time of the Fathers. We own it grates our ears, and jars upon our feelings, to hear the former, essentially un-Catholic forms, used by preachers and writers; they want affection, they are insipid, formal, they remind us of Geneva caps, and smack of predestination. The Rhemes translators have explained their reason for their translation in a note, p. 585, as follows: "We Catholics must not say *The Lord*, but *Our Lord*; as we say *Our Lady* for his mother, not *The Lady*. Let us keep our forefathers' words, and we shall easily keep our old and true faith, which we had of the first Christians." Nor is such a modification of the word, "Dominus," peculiar to the English Catholics; the Syriac version, and after it the Syriac church, calls Christ, not simply ܡܪܝܬܐ morio, "*The Lord*," but ܡܪܝܬܐ moran, "*our Lord*," even where the Greek has ὁ Κύριος. If, therefore, it be considered too great a departure from accuracy in translation to restore the pronoun in the text of our version, let us at least preserve it in our instructions, and still more in our formularies of prayer.

But it had been well, if Dr. Challoner's alterations had given

stability to the text, and formed a standard to which subsequent editors had conformed. But, so far from this being the case, new and often important modifications have been made in every edition which has followed, till, at length, many may appear rather new versions than revisions of the old. We believe Catholic Britain to be the only country where such a laxity of attention has existed in regard to the purity of its authorised version.\* And we should have had even less reason to complain, had these systematic variations been the only vicissitudes to which it has been subject. The mass of typographical errors to be found in some editions is quite frightful, from many of them falling upon important words, and not so much disfiguring them, which would lead to suspicion and thereby to detection, as transforming them into others that give a correct grammatical, but unsound theological, sense. In 1632, the king's printers, Barker and Lucas, were fined £3,000, for the omission of one monosyllable; and the Oxford bible of 1792 is considered a curiosity because it reads, Luke xxii. 34, *Philip* instead of *Peter*. But, in the edition we have referred to, of Dublin 1810, revised, under Dr. Troy's direction, by the Rev. B. MacMahon, many such substitutions are to be found. A table at the end gives a number of them, as Mat. xvi. 23, "thou *favourest* not," for "thou *savourest* not;" and Romans vii. 18, "to accomplish that which is good I find *out*," instead of "I find *not*." The table of errata is, however, very far from complete; for instance, the following among others are omitted in it. Gal. iv. 9, "how turn you again to the *work*" (for *weak*) "and poor elements." 1b. v. 23, "modesty, continency, *charity*," instead of "*chastity*." In a note, p. 309, we read, "Sin—which was asleep before, was *weakened* by the prohibition," instead of "*awakened*."

Our principal object, however, at present, is to turn the attention of the Catholic clergy, and particularly the bishops of Ireland, and the vicars apostolic of England and Scotland, to the want of a complete revision of the version itself, for the purpose of settling a standard text, from which editors in future may not be allowed to depart. In this manner alone will the Catholics of the empire be provided with what every other portion of the Church has long since possessed. It is far from our purpose to undertake a complete exposure of the many passages which want emendation—such a task would require a treatise. In order to confine ourselves within reasonable limits, we will only consider the necessity which a new revision would impose on those who should undertake it, of a minute and often com-

---

\* We have not forgotten the Rev. Mr. Curtis's late Letter to the Bishop of London.

plicated study of the original texts. We have selected this view of the matter, because we think it the point most neglected in the past, and most likely to be overlooked, and to form the great stumbling-block in any future revision. For, at first sight, it must appear an almost superfluous task to proceed, in such an undertaking, beyond the accurate study of the work immediately translated. The Vulgate is written in Latin, and it would, therefore, appear sufficient to possess an accurate knowledge of the Latin language, in order to translate any work written in it into our own. It is our wish to prove the fallacy of such reasoning; and, on the contrary, to show what varied and often delicate questions of philology the translation may involve, and how impossible it is to correct or discover the mistakes of our Douay version, without a constant recourse to the original Hebrew and Greek texts. The object of such reference will be, to decide the true meaning of expressions, obscure or doubtful in the Latin. In the few examples which we intend to give, we shall consider the Alexandrine, or, as it is commonly called, the Septuagint, version, as the original of the Psalms; because it is well known that the Latin used by us, and inserted in the Vulgate, is made upon that version, and not on the Hebrew original.

Let us select, in the first instance, a very simple example. In the fiftieth Psalm, v. 14 (Heb. li. 14), the Vulgate has, "et spiritu *principali* confirma me." The Douay translators understood the adjective in the sense of *principal*, *excellent*, and accordingly translated the sentence thus, "and strengthen me with a *perfect* spirit." Looking simply at the Latin, the word will certainly bear that sense; as Cicero says, "Causarum aliæ sunt *perfectæ* et *principales*." But the question here is, did the author of the Vulgate use the word in this sense, and not rather in its other meaning of princely? A reference to the Greek, from which the translation of this book was made, decides the question. For there we read, πνεύματι ἡγεμονικῷ στήριξόν με, "strengthen me with a *princely* spirit." In the Hebrew, the word used is נָדִיבָה which bears the same meaning though it also derivately signifies, "generous," "noble."\*

Wisdom viii. 21, we have the following sentence: "and as I knew that I could not otherwise be *continent*, except God gave it." This is a verbal translation of the Latin, "et ut scivi quoniam aliter non possem esse *continens* nisi Deus det." The word *continens* corresponds to the Greek ἐγκρατής here as in every other passage wherein it occurs through the sapiential

\* Perhaps the old word "lordly" would best express the double meaning, as its corresponding term *herrlich* would in German.



books, and is never, save in this passage, rendered in our version by *continent*. This point is easily established. Eccles. vi. 28, we have the same subject, the acquisition of wisdom, treated as in our text, in these words, "Investiga illam, et manifestabitur tibi, et *continens factus*, ne derelinquas eam." Our translators did not render these words, by "being made *continent*," but by "when thou *hast gotten* her." The Greek has καὶ ἐγκρατὴς γενομενός (v. 27, ed. Bos.) These words occur in two other places, where, however, there is no ellipsis, but the object is expressed xv. 1, "Qui *continens* est justitiæ apprehendet illam;" translated, "he that *possesseth* justice shall lay hold on her." And xxvii. 33, "Ira et furor utraque execrabilia sunt, et vir peccator *continens* illorum erit;" rendered, "and the sinful man shall *be subject* to them," that is, shall *contain* or *possess* them. This last example proves, that *continens*, or ἐγκρατὴς, does not signify "qui se continet," one who *restrains* himself, but one who contains or holds something else; and the first instance quoted proves that it is so used elliptically, with omission of the object so held or contained.

These are the only other passages, if we mistake not, in which the Latin word occurs as an equivalent to the cited Greek one throughout these books. We may next ask, ought a deviation to have been made from the meaning they elsewhere invariably bear, in Sap. viii. 21? And we answer, unhesitatingly, not. The entire passage is concerning the acquisition of wisdom. From verse 9 to v. 19, the writer gives us an account of his searches after it. In vv. 19, 20, he states the causes that led him to them; first, his having been gifted with an ingenuous disposition; and, secondly, his having preserved himself from sin. The verse under consideration naturally follows: "and as I knew that I could not otherwise *possess it* (wisdom) unless God gave it (for this was also a point of wisdom to know whose gift it was), I went to the Lord," &c. But if we read with our present version, "as I knew I could not *be continent*," &c. we have to meet multiplied difficulties. First, that not a word has been said about continence, but the whole antecedent matter has been concerning wisdom; secondly, that the parenthesis makes no sense, for the thing there mentioned as a gift cannot be continence, as *it* must refer to a substantive, and not an adjective, such as *continent*; and, moreover, its antithesis is lost, "it was a point of wisdom to know whose gift *wisdom* is;" thirdly, that the prayer which follows, for the quality in question is entirely for wisdom, and not for continence, which is never asked for. These reasons are more than sufficient for retaining, in this passage, the sense invariably attributed to *continens* in every other.

Ps. lxxvii. 12. presents an instance in which an ambiguity of phrase compels us to recur, not only to the Greek, but, beyond this, to the original Hebrew. The Latin text runs thus, "Dominus dabit verbum evangelizantibus, *virtute multa*," and is thus translated in the Douay version, "The Lord shall give the word to them that preach good tidings, *in great power*." The word *virtus* is manifestly ambiguous, as it often signifies a *host*, or *multitude*. Hence the common phrase, "Dominus virtutum" is always rendered "the Lord of Hosts," and "virtutes cœlorum" "the host of heaven." It became, therefore, the translator's duty to recur to the Greek, where he would find the words, *δυναμει πολλη*. But here the same ambiguity exists. For the word *δυναμις* often indeed corresponds to terms significative in Hebrew of strength, as *נְבוֹרָה*, \* *כֹּחַ*, and the derivations of *עָזָה*; but it almost as frequently corresponds to words of multitude, as *עַם* a people, || *הַמָּוֹ* a multitude, ¶ *תָּנָה* a camp,\*\* *חַיִּל* an army, †† and, above all, to *צָבָא* the most usual word for a collection of men, or a host. As the equivalent of this word *δυναμις* occurs some hundreds of times in the bible, and one of the occasions is the very passage under discussion, for the Hebrew text, lxxviii. 12, reads *צָבָא רַב*. Thus, no doubt remains that the ambiguous Greek word *δυναμις* here stands for "multitude" or "crowds;" and this again determines the signification of the no less ambiguous Latin term "virtus."

All this investigation was absolutely necessary for the translator, before he could make sure of rightly rendering so simple a word; and the use of the adjective *multa* might have led him to suspect that number and not strength was contemplated. This verse would afford us room for several other curious philological remarks in illustration of our subject; but for brevity's sake we pass them over. We need hardly observe, that it alludes to the custom frequently mentioned in scripture, ††† and practised by other eastern nations besides the Jews, §§ of female choirs coming forth to celebrate the conquerors on their return from battle. The word corresponding in the original to "evangelizantibus" is in the Hebrew in the plural feminine.

We now call the attention of our biblical readers to a very

\* 1 Chron. xxix. 2. Es. ii. 69. Jer. xlviii. 45.

† Jud. viii. 21. 2 Reg. xviii. 10, &c. † Job xl. 11.

§ Job xli. 14. Ps. xx. 1, xlv. 1. || 1 Chron. xxi. 2.

¶ 2 Sam. vi. 19. 1 Reg. xx. 28. Jer. iii. 23. \*\* 1 Chron. xii. 22.

†† This Hebrew word is ambiguous as the Greek and Latin ones in the text; but constantly means an army, as Exod. xiv. 28.

†† See Exod. xv. 20. Jud. xi. 34. 1 Sam. xviii. 6, 7. 2 Sam. i. 20.

§§ See, for instance, the account of the mountaineers of Tiproa, by J. Rawlins Esq. in the "Asiatic Researches," vol. ii. Lond. 1799, p. 191.

curious rendering in the Vulgate, which seems to us to have been misunderstood by our translators, in consequence of not having attended to the original. This is Sophon. iii. 18, where the Hebrew has as follows, נָוִי מִמֹּעֵד אֲסַמְתִּי מִמֶּךָ דָּוִי. The Vulgate translates thus, "*Nugas* qui a lege recesserunt, congregabo, quia ex te erant;" and is rendered thus by the Douay editors, "the *triflers* that were departed from the law I will gather together, because they were of thee." It must be noticed, that the Latin word *nugæ* purposely corresponds to the Hebrew words נִגְהֵ *nughe*. This is a passive participle of the verb נָגַה, and means "afflicted;"\* though some lexicographers prefer the meaning of "removed," which occurs in the root, and is given by the Greek version, and some Jewish commentators.† Now the rendering of St. Jerome strikes out a totally different signification, whether we translate it by *trifles* or *triflers*. But there is an old meaning of the word *nuga*, which would exactly agree with the first of those we have mentioned. In Plautus, it means a "*lamentation*," the *navia* or mourning song of the *præfica*, and this is allowed to be probably the oldest meaning of the word. Hence, by a synecdoche, it might be used for a "mourner," as it is used for a "trifler." The question, therefore, which a translator of the Vulgate would have to ask himself would be, can St. Jerome in this passage have used the word *nugas* in that older sense; and we should certainly be inclined to answer it affirmatively on the following grounds.

1. St. Jerome, in his commentary, seems indifferent which interpretation we take, his own or Aquila's. "*Nugas*, sive ut Aquila interpretatus est, *translatos* qui a te recesserunt congregabo."‡ If he had used the word in the ordinary sense, the two versions could not for an instant have been compared. But the *sorrowful* and the *banished* are words whose meanings may be easily exchanged, as they are intimately connected by cause and effect.

2. Any one that has studied the version and commentaries of this Father must have seen their constant accordance with the traditions and opinions of the Jews; and were it necessary for us to illustrate this point by examples, we could do it by many passages in his notes upon the very book of minor prophets now under consideration. But, in fact, he tells us himself that in difficult passages he made it a point to follow his Jewish masters.§

\* See Winer's "Lexicon Manuale," p. 396.

† Rosenmüller's "Prophetæ minores." Lips. 1816, vol. iv. p. 68.

‡ Comment. in loc.

§ "Hæc dico ut noveris quos in Prophetæ hujus campo habuerim præcursores, quos tamen. non in omnibus sum secutus, ut iudex potius operis eorum quam interpretæ existerem, diceramque quid mihi videretur in singulis, et quid ab Hebræorum magistris acceperim."

Now the Jewish interpreters and commentators give two meanings to the word. The Targum, or Chaldaic, paraphrase, and R. Solomon Jarchi, render it in the same manner as Aquila, approved by St. Jerome, "the removed;" Kimchi, and most others, give the other meaning, "the sorrowful;" and the Gemara, an old comment upon the Babylonish Talmud, shows them both to have been maintained by the ancient Jewish teachers, inasmuch as it attributes the one to R. Joshua, and the other to R. Eleazar.\* Supposing "nugæ" to have been used by St. Jerome in its less ordinary sense, we find him approving of exactly the two interpretations which his avowed teachers would have delivered to him, and hesitating which to choose. But if the word mean "trifles" or "triflers," it is impossible to account for the source whence he derived his interpretation, not deducible from the Hebrew root, unknown to every other biblical writer, and not taught him by those on whose authority in such points he relied.

3. St. Jerome, in his commentary, makes an apology, and gives a reason for having used this word, "Id quod diximus *nugas* sciamus in Hebræo ipsum Latinum esse sermonem, ut propterea a nobis ita ut in Hebræo erat positum ut nosse possimus linguam Hebræam omnium linguarum esse matricem." This reasoning supposes that he had gone out of his way to select this word, which certainly would not have been the case, had he used it in its ordinary acceptation. On the other hand, we cannot suspect him of having sacrificed the sense to a mere resemblance between the Hebrew and Latin word. We must, therefore, conclude, that the word *nugæ* is here used in a rarer sense, but which suits the meaning of the original; and the result of these reflections seems to be that this word in this passage is to be rendered by *sorrowful* or *mourners*, a signification at once allied to the version of Aquila, given by the Rabbins, and accounting for St. Jerome's excuses.

It is singular that St. Jerome should translate, on every occasion except two, the Hebrew word נָשָׂא and its derivatives, by *calumniari* or its substantives. Yet this Hebrew verb is admitted by all to signify *oppression* or *violence*, sometimes perhaps with an addition of *fraud*. The translator of the Vulgate must, therefore, inquire, whether St. Jerome really meant the word *calumniari* to be taken in the sense in which it is usually taken, or whether it bears in his version the peculiar signification of *violence*. If the former were the case, he *must* translate it by *calumny*, however this may differ from the original, since the

translator's duty is only to present a faithful transcript of the Latin version. But if St. Jerome used it in the second sense, then the word *calumny* cannot be used, because it never bears with us the signification of *violence*. It is impossible to conceive that this learned Father could have used these terms in their ordinary acceptation, for they are often placed where the context will not admit of any signification but that of *violence* or *oppression*. Thus they are used in apposition with terms of unjust oppression,\* they are spoken of whole nations, which certainly could not well be said to be an object of calumny or false accusation.† The translator would, therefore, decide that the word *calumnia* and its derivatives in the Vulgate signify oppression. Yet this is not universally the case, but only when it corresponds to the Hebrew עשק or its nouns. For example, Genes. xliii. 18, we have the words, "ut devolvat in nos *calumniam*," yet as the Hebrew verb there is not עשק but להתבלל, we must translate the word by a *false accusation*. It is only, therefore, by having the original open before us, that we could ascertain when the word was to be translated *violence* or *oppression*, or when *calumny* or *false-accusation*. The Douay translators have indeed generally been right in their rendering of this word, because the context is generally such as to force us to a correct interpretation; but where this did not lead them, they have failed, and so left the work unfinished. Thus, Gen. xxvi. 20, Levit. xix. 30, Prov. xxviii. 16, Ezech. xxii. 29, and Job x. 3, our version presents the word *calumny*.† The last of these passages is remarkable, for Job is there said to upbraid God with *calumniating* him, when it is evident, from the circumstances of his history, as well as from the context, and the general tenor of his complaints, that harsh and oppressive treatment was what he objected to the conduct of the Almighty in his regard. Yet in all these passages the same word עשק occurs in the original, and as we have seen already that St. Jerome understood this word of oppression, though he rendered it by *calumniari*, it is clear that in all these passages he meant this to have that meaning; and so it should have been rendered by our translators.

Only one thing would be wanting to make this reasoning satisfactory, and that is, to prove that the Latin word *calumnia*

\* Deut. xxviii. 29, 33. Eccles. v. 7. Jer. vii. 6. Ezech. xxii. 29. Amos iv. 1. Two remarkable examples are Jer. xxii. 3. "Liberate *vi oppressum* de manu *calumniatoris*," and xxi. 12, where nearly the same words occur.

† Jer. i. 33, Osee v. 11. But see particularly 1 Kings (or Sam.) xii. 4, where the people say to Samuel, upon his retiring from government, "Non es *calumniatus* nos."

‡ Is. liv. 14, the first edition of our version, Douay 1609-10, has *calumny*—the modern correction, *oppression*.

really has this meaning of oppression, or perhaps more properly of *vexation*. The Lexicons do not, it is true, present a signification sufficiently strong; the one, for instance, which approaches nearest in Forcellini\* is No. 6, "Sumitur etiam latius pro quacunq[ue] vitiosa calliditate, astutia, vexatione." Craft, however, and not oppression, is here the essential ingredient, and all the examples brought show that he understands it only of vexatious, petty, proceedings in law. From this it would appear, that our translators were led only by the force of the context to select the extraordinary, but correct, interpretation which they have generally given. But it seems to us, that this word easily passed from its forensic use to a wider signification of oppression in acts; especially when under *the sanction of law*, which we apprehend to be the most ordinary use of *πρω*. Hence this might be accurately rendered by *calumniari* in Latin. We think the following authority may justify this assertion. Under Domitian, and other cruel Emperors a heavy tax was imposed upon all Jews, and was exacted with peculiar rigour and even cruelty. Suetonius thus writes of the Emperor we have named, "Præter cœteros, Judaicus fiscus acerbissime exactus est."† Under Nerva, the odious imposition was abolished, and a medal remains to commemorate the event. It bears this legend:—

FISCI. IVDAICI. CALVMNIA. SVBLATA.‡

Here the word *calumnia* evidently signifies "tyranny," or "oppression," and will fully justify the use of the word in this sense in the Vulgate, and consequently the translation which we suggest.

We cannot take leave of this word without recalling to our reader's notice another remarkable text where it occurs. We allude to Luke iii. 14. The Baptist is there giving instructions to soldiers, on campaign,§ what they are to do. He suggests three points to their observance; the *first* is to do violence to no man, the *third* to be content with their pay. These two points are not only in accordance with the profession and habits of the persons instructed, but are also in perfect harmony the one with the other. The soldiers are not to enrich themselves by rapine, but to be satisfied with what they receive. We should expect the intermediate portion of advice to be of like character, it is, *μηδὲ συκοφαντῆσθαι*. This the Vulgate renders by *neque*

\* Sub voce *calumnia*, t. i. p. 450. col. l. Patav. 1827.

† Domit. c. xii. tom. ii. p. 328. Edit. Burm.

‡ Eckhel, "Doctrina num. vet." Tom. vi. p. 404. From the Imperial Cabinet of Vienna.

§ This circumstance is of importance for the rendering of the text. The word is *σφραγευόμενοι*. See Michaelis, Marsh's transl. t. i. p. 61.

*calumniam faciatis.* The Douay version again translates, "neither calumniate any man."\* This is totally out of keeping with the context: The fact is, that the verb *συκοφαντῶ* in the Greek of the Septuagint means *to oppress*, and is frequently put for the Hebrew עָשָׂה.† It had thus acquired that force in Jewish Greek like so many other words,‡ and should be so rendered. This has been already noticed by writers on the Greek of the New Testament.§

We shall perhaps require still more indulgence from our readers for our observations on another passage from the Old Testament. Ps. xxxix. 9 (6 in the Septuagint), the Greek version has *σωμα δε κατηρησσω μοι*, "thou hast fitted a body to me." The Latin version of the Psalms, as we have before observed, is made from this Greek translation, and yet in this passage it has "*aures autem perfecisti mihi*," which the Douay version no less singularly renders, "thou hast pierced ears for me." For the verb "*perficio*" certainly never bore this signification in any ancient writer. At first sight, it would appear as though the Vulgate, particularly if we admit the correctness of the English rendering, had in this verse been taken from the Hebrew, which has אָזְנוֹת כְּרִית לִי "*aures perforasti mihi*." Before, therefore, censuring the Douay rendering, and consequently showing the necessity of recourse to the original texts, we must prove that the Vulgate in this verse is not made upon the Hebrew, which it seems to resemble, but on the Septuagint, to which it bears so little affinity.

A slight comparison of the entire Psalm, in the Vulgate, with the two texts, will satisfy the most superficial scholar, that every other verse is translated from the Greek; and this affords us a strong presumption, that this passage was derived from the same source. The principal difficulty resides in the substitution of "*aures*, ears," for *σωμα*, "body." But this change is easily accounted for in two ways. First, several copies of the Septuagint read *ωτια*, "ears," instead of *σωμα*. In Parsons's continuation of Holmes's ritual edition of that version, we have the following note upon the passage, "*Σωμα δε]* *ωτια δε*, (Cod.) 39, *ωτια δε*, 142, 156 (292 marg.)"|| The same reading is given by

\* The English authorised Version has nearly the same, "Neither accuse any man falsely."

† Job xxxv. 9. Psalm clxviii. 121. Proverbs xiv. 33; xxii. 16; xxviii. 3. Eccles. iv. 1.

‡ It is an admitted principle in Hermeneutics, that the Greek of the Seventy is one of the great keys to the right interpretation of the Greek of the New Testament. See Arigler, "*Hermeneutica Biblica Generalis*." Vienna, 1813, p. 103.

§ Vid. Schleusener sub voce *συκοφαντῶ*, and Kuinel in loc.

|| The MSS. here quoted are thus described in the Prolegomena to the work:—

Bos from a Greek commentary. The Vulgate, therefore, may have been made upon a manuscript which read thus; and in this supposition no objection exists to its having rendered this verse from the Greek. Secondly, it seems probable that originally the Latin read "corpus," and not "aures;" and then there would be no discrepancy between it and the present Greek text. The Mosarabic and Roman Psalters have it, as well as St. Augustine, Cassiodorus, St. Ambrose, and St. Hilary.\* The Veronese Psalter, published by Bianchini, presents the same reading.† The use of the verb "perfecisti" leaves little room to doubt that this was the original reading. The substantive and the verb agreed perfectly; when, at a later period, the former was changed, the latter was allowed to remain, and did not suit so well.

The moment this difficulty is removed, and no doubt consequently remains that the verse is translated from the Septuagint, it is plain that "perfecisti" corresponds to *καρπορω*. Now, this verb means sometimes in Scripture, "to complete, to perfect;" as for example, 1 Thess. iii. 10, where the Vulgate translates it "ut compleam;" and, therefore, no doubt, "perficio" is here used in this sense. The old Douay version has correctly "eares thou hast perfited to me," which was subsequently altered into its present reading. If this change was made in deference to the original Hebrew, a principle of translation was violated; for the Greek should have been consulted, and the Vulgate should not have been here abandoned for the Hebrew, any more than in a thousand other places where they differ.

We will now notice a case, which shows how the incautious insertion of the smallest monosyllable may totally alter the sense. It is the well-known passage, Jo. ii. 4, "Quid mihi et tibi mulier?" The old Rhemish editors of 1582 scrupulously rendered word for word, not without a sacrifice of clearness and propriety, "*What is to me and to thee woman?*" In a note they explain their motives, grounded on the ambiguous character of the phrase which they did not think it proper more definitely to express. In the correction by Dr. Challoner, this ambiguity

\* 39. Cod. Dorothei, ii. Membr. soc. ix.—142. Bib. Aulicæ Vindob. Theol. v; membr. pervet. optimæ notæ.—156. Bib. Basil. membr. 4 adm. antiq. sine accent. cum vers. lat. interlin.—292. Cod. Bib. Medic. num. iii. Plat. vi. opt. notæ membran. in fol. sæc. xi.

\* Ap. Sabatier, "Biblorum sacrorum versiones antiquæ," 1743.

† "Psalter. duplex cum cantus," p. 63. Published in his "Vindiciæ canonice scripturarum vulgatæ Latine editionis." Rome, 1740. In a note on this passage, he adds, "Favet utrique lectioni versio arabica." This is a mistake, which, however, does not surprise us, as most that has been written on the Arabic version of the Psalms is very inaccurate. This, however, is not the place to prove this point, and substitute more exact observations.



was preserved; and, indeed, it yet remains in many modern editions. Some, however, as that of Edinburgh 1792, have slipped in "*it*," and read, "What is *it* to me and to thee?" But there can be no doubt that this translation is erroneous, and that for many reasons.

First, this form of expression is very common in the Old Testament, and invariably means that there is no connexion between the persons thus mentioned. It may be sufficient to consult the passages quoted below in the margin.\*

Secondly, it occurs very frequently in the classics, Greek and Latin, and bears invariably the same meaning. Thus Anacreon:

Τί γὰρ μάχαισι κἄμοι·  
\* \* \*

Τί Πλειάδεσσι κἄμοι.†

Aulus Gellius quotes from Epictetus (Lib. ii.) τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ ἄνθρωπε; ἀρκεῖ ἐμοὶ τὰ ἐμὰ κακὰ.‡ Quintus Curtius has, in like manner, "Quid nobis tuum est;"§ and Ovid,

"Quid mihi cum Siculis, inter Scythiamque Getasque?"||

Martial writes thus, "Martialis Deciano suo S. Quid nobis inquis cum epistola? parumne tibi præstamus si legimus epigrammata."¶ We could add examples from Oriental writers. But what is most to be noted is, that the classics often fill up the ellipsis, by adding an adjective or substantive. Thus Philostratus, *Σοὶ δὲ τί καὶ Πρωτεσίλεω κοινόν*; \*\* Propertius uses the word "gratia."

"Cum Tiberi Nilo gratia nulla fuit."††

And Claudian, "ratio."

"Quo tibi cum pedibus ratio? quid carmina culpas?"

Scandere qui nescis versiculos laceras."‡‡

The Persians, as for instance Firdausi, use the substantive كار, "negotium."

Thirdly, in the New Testament, the phrase occurs several times besides this place, and manifestly has the same meaning. We will at present only notice the message to Pilate from his

\* *Jos.* xii. 24; *Jud.* xi. 12; 2 *Sam.* xvi. 10; 1 *Reg.* xvii. 18; 2 *Reg.* iii. 13; *Mic.* ii. 2. Cf. Glassius, "Philologia sacra," *Leipz.* 1776, tom. i. p. 491.

† *Ode* xvii. 264, 276.

‡ *Noctes Atticæ*, ed. Gronov. Lib. i. c. ii. p. 37.

§ *Lib.* viii. c. 8, § 16.

¶ *Tibet.* lib. iii. eleg. xi. 54.

‡‡ *Introd.* to lib. ii. *Epig.*

\*\* *Philost.* *Her.* p. 8, ed. Boiss. In like manner, Schiller, "Jungfrau von Orleans,"

5 scene, 5 act, has

"Nicht kann gemein seyn  
Zwischen dir und mir."

†† *Lib.* ii. eleg. xxiii. 30.

‡‡ *Epigr.* xxviii. In *Podagr.*

wife, Matt. xxvii. 19: "Have thou nothing to do with that just man;" in the Vulgate, "Nihil tibi et justo huic." What confirms this interpretation is, that whenever a thing is said not to concern a person, the preposition is used with the accusative. Thus, when Judas restores the price of his treason, saying that he had betrayed innocent blood, he is answered, *τί πρὸς ἡμᾶς; οὐδὲν ἔχου.* "Quid *ad nos?* tu videris." (Ib. 4.) And when Peter eagerly enquires about John, our Saviour says to him, *Τί πρὸς σε;* "Quid *ad te?*"\* "What is it to thee?" Precisely as in the classics; for instance, Martial,

"Sobrius siccus est Aper: quid *ad me?*"†

These considerations are sufficient to prove, that the accurate rendering of these words is the same as has been given in Matt. xxvii. 19, "what have I to do with thee?" And we prefer this to the one given in the new version which heads our article; "what hast thou to do with me?" Because this seems to make the answer signify, "why dost thou interfere with me?" a signification which the phrase does not generally bear; for it simply expresses the absence or denial of communication between the parties.

The insertion, therefore, of the pronoun "it" destroys this sense completely, and determines the text in favour of a signification manifestly inaccurate.‡

The philological discussion of this text ought naturally to end here. But an objection to the interpretation we have preferred will certainly start up in the mind of the pious reader. Is not the expression unaccountably harsh? Can we suppose our Blessed Saviour to have addressed his holy and dear mother in terms that disowned her, and denied all connexion between them? Nay, we should feel but little satisfaction ourselves in this discussion, did we feel, at its close, that we had by it derogated aught from her honour, whom, from infancy, we have been taught especially to reverence; or that we had successfully striven to establish an interpretation which apparently favoured the cavils of our religious adversaries. For we are aware how this translation has been considered by some as discountenancing our Catholic feelings towards God's mother, by proving that her own son treated her with little respect. Such, for instance, is the view presented by a certain Mr. Ford Vance, a chosen preacher against our doctrines, who having quoted the Protestant version, thus observes:—"The Roman Catholics say that this is a wrong

\* Jo. xxi. 22.

† Lib. xii. epig. 80.

‡ However, Prof. Scholz, in his *Version of the Gospels* (Frank. 1829), has retained this meaning, "Weib, was kümmert das mich und dich?" That of Augusti and De Wette (Heidelb. 1814) has, "Weib was habe ich mit dir zu beschaffen?"

translation of the passage, and that it should be rendered, "Woman, what is that to you and to me?" And in reply he appeals to Matt. viii. 29.\* Our preceding remarks will be sufficient to show that we have no wish whatever to assert any such thing. But we deny all the consequences which he and others would draw from their version, and assert that the most timid Catholic need fear nothing in adopting it.

It is easy to prove, that the expression in question might be, and often was, used in the most respectful and even affectionate manner; and as some of our examples, at least, have not been before quoted, we will enter more fully into the matter. We have a stronger motive for so doing, that even writers not engaged on controversy have expressed themselves differently from what we deem the truth. Thus Lambert Bos describes the phrase in general, as one "qua molestia et contemptus innuitur."†

In the New Testament it certainly is used respectfully by Pilate's wife, when she calls Jesus "that just man." Nor, we think, can it be doubted, that the expostulation of the evil spirits, to which Mr. Vance refers, has the same character. For they give him his most glorious title, saying, "What have we to do with thee, Jesus, son of God?" and then they make a supplicating request to be allowed to enter into the swine; which is granted them. In the Old Testament, the phrase is used in the same manner. For instance, there surely was neither "annoyance nor contempt" intended in those words whereby the widow obtained from the prophet the resurrection of her son; "What have I to do with thee, thou man of God? Art thou come to call my sins to remembrance, and to slay my son?"‡ There is an expression, similar in signification, which is manifestly used with similar feelings. We allude to Luke v. 8, where Peter, falling on his knees before Jesus, says to him, "*Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord!*" It is exceeding respect which, in these two cases, suggests expressions, at first sight indicative of a wish to have no communication with the person addressed.

Among profane writers the same use of the phrase may be easily proved. When the banished poet addresses his writings in these words,

"Quid mihi vobiscum est, infelix cura, libelli  
Ingenio perii qui miser ipse meo;"§

there is certainly expressed a feeling of affection and attachment

\* Sermons on the invocation of angels and saints. Ser. ii. p. 40.

† *Philippus Graecus* ed. Schæffer, 1808, p. 227.

‡ 1 Reg. xvii. 34.

§ Trist. Lib. ii. eleg. 1. 2.

to his unfortunate productions. The most respectful use of the expression is made in the east. In the account of a "good monitor," published by Kosegarten, we are told, how upon a message being brought him that the caliph wished to see him, he replied, *مالي ولا مير المؤمنين* "what have I to do with the prince of the faithful?"\* This was certainly not said with any intention of slighting that personage, whose call he obeyed; for his conduct is described with a desire to commend, and to propose it as an example.

But we will quote another instance, which, we flatter ourselves, will leave no room to doubt this expression could be used in the most affectionate manner. The Emperor Marcus Aurelius closes one of his letters to his beloved preceptor, Fronto, in these words—"Valebis mihi Fronto, ubi ubi es, mellissime, meus amor, mea voluptas. *Quid mihi tecum est? amo absentem.*"†

These examples are more than sufficient to prove, that our Saviour could use the phrase as we have interpreted it, without incurring the imputation of undutifulness, which some writers, in their zeal against Catholics, seem almost eager to cast upon him. It may have been spoken in the most respectful and affectionate manner; and, as commentators have remarked, our Blessed Lady did not view it in the light of a refusal or a check; for after it she felt sure that her prayer was granted, and gave directions for the working of the miracle.

The length to which we have been carried by several of our examples, obliges us to suppress many others, on which we would willingly have dilated. We must, however, for the present omit them, and will briefly advert to one only. This is Heb. xi. 1, where the Latin word, "substantia," is rendered "substance." "Faith is the *substance* of things to be hoped for." This rendering leads the reader to a wrong conclusion; as faith may be the indication, or demonstration, but certainly not the substance, of what we hope for. The Rhemes translators say, that the Latin word here bore the meaning of its corresponding Greek, *υποστασις*, "groundwork," or "foundation;" and though, with their usual caution, they retained the very word "substance," they added a marginal note to this effect, "By this word substance is meant that faith is the ground of our hope." The note has disappeared, but the word which they knew to be unintelligible without it, has been retained. The Anglican version has the same word, but likewise adds an explanatory marginal note. A reference to the original Greek could alone guide the translator of the vulgate; because the Latin word could never have been

\* "Chrestom. Arab." Lips. 1836, p. 36.

† "M. C. Frontonis et M. Aurelii Epist." Romæ, 1823, p. 106.

supposed to have this meaning, except as equivalent to that Greek term.

It may be necessary even sometimes to consult St. Jerome's commentary, to ascertain the exact sense in which he used words or phrases. For example, "*Butyrum et mal comedet, ut sciat reprobare malum et eligere bonum.*"\* From his commentary on this passage, it is evident that he used the particle *ut* in the sense of *quomvis*, as Ovid does,

"*Ut desint viros, tamen est laudanda voluntas.*"†

The sense would be, that the Messiah should eat the common food of infants, although he, in truth, possessed discretion and knowledge.

These examples are, we trust, sufficient to elucidate our views regarding a complete and authorized revisal of our English Catholic version. Much we have to say respecting the prefaces and notes, the indices and titles which should accompany any such authorized edition. On these matters it will be time enough to express our sentiments, when we shall perceive that the hints here thrown out have been esteemed worthy of notice, and that attention is turned to the necessity or propriety of providing us with a standard edition, no longer subject to alteration from the caprice or ignorance of individuals. The new version which has led to the remarks we have made in this paper, cannot, as we have already observed, supersede the necessity of such a revision. With several of its verbal changes we are certainly pleased; but there are others of which we cannot bring ourselves to approve. The change of "*Christ*" into "*Messiah*," and "*gospel*" into "*good tidings*," seems unnecessary, and likely to startle ordinary readers. For the rejected words have long become part of the language.

Throughout the notes and preface there is a drift which cannot be overlooked, and which has our cordial approbation; it is to place the gospels in their proper light, as narratives not intended to form a complete digest of our Saviour's life, but as "*occasional pieces*," so to speak, suggested by particular circumstances, and primarily directed to readers possessing different qualifications from ours, who could understand much that to us must be obscure. The impression on the reader's mind, after having perused this edition, must be, that Christianity never depended, for its code or evidences, upon the compilation of these documents, and that they never could have been intended for a rule of faith. Considering the work in this light, we have an additional pleasure in bearing witness to the learning, diligence, and acuteness of its author.

\* Ia. viii. 15.

† De Ponto, lib. iii. ep. iv. 19.

ART. X.—1. *A Letter to Archdeacon Singleton, on the Ecclesiastical Commission*, by the Rev. Sydney Smith. London, 1837.

2. *Quarterly Review for February 1837, Article VII.*

3. *Pusey on Cathedral Institutions*. London, 1838. 2d. edit.

WHEN Dr. Philpotts fulminated, *ex cathedra*, his malignant charge of “treachery, aggravated by perjury,” against our Catholic legislators, the alleged “treachery,” as distinguished from the charge of perjury, must have consisted in the supposed exercise of their legislative functions to the prejudice of the Anglican Church, in breach of some solemn compact which they had entered into with the Legislature; and their alleged perjury must have consisted in their supposed violation of an oath by which they were pledged to maintain that compact. The absurdity, injustice, and futility of these charges we have demonstrated in another article in our present number. Our reasons for what we conceive would otherwise have been a labour as unnecessary as it is degrading, we shall develop in the present article; and we have quoted Dr. Philpotts for the purpose only of showing, upon his high authority, that in the abstract, and independently of any question of perjury, in HIS opinion, the attempt to violate a solemn compact, entered into with the Legislature, is an act of “treachery.” In the simplicity and sincerity of our hearts, we had believed and trusted that the Emancipation Act was intended as a real and substantial recognition of our civil and religious rights and liberties; and that although we had not the protective sanction of oaths for their preservation, yet we had in truth the highest guarantee for the full toleration and exercise of those rights and liberties—the honour and faith of the British nation. If this be no delusion,—if such be the substance of the compact between the Legislature and the Catholic body—then, in our opinion, a design to eradicate our holy religion, and to subvert our dearly purchased civil rights, is “treachery” indeed. The MOTIVES which have led to this attempt upon our dearest privileges are open and avowed:—the necessity of re-organizing and reconstructing the Anglican Church; the incompatibility of HER safety with the existence of OUR religion; the necessity of TRANSFERRING the influence of *our clergy* to her own; and, THEREFORE, the necessity of the *suppression* of our faith.

It is our deliberate conviction that this charge of treachery and perjury, which has been so industriously raised against the Catholic legislators, is used only as an instrument to promote this most treacherous conspiracy; and in this use, which is intended

to be made of the charge, consists, in our opinion, its only importance; an importance, however, which justifies our exhibition of its absurdity and iniquity.

In order to explain our situation—religious and political—to our fellow-countrymen, we are bound to examine into the present state and prospects of the Anglican Church; and our only apology for so doing, is, that we act on the defensive, and that silence would be treason to our Catholic fellow-subjects.

Let us then proceed to enquire into the motives which have led to this calumnious accusation against the Catholic members of the legislature; and we have no hesitation in saying, that they are founded on a conviction of the ultimate failure of the Anglican establishment, and an increasing dread and hatred of the Catholic religion, which lead to a desire to throw odium upon its faith, nay, even to seek its utter destruction, in order that, with safety to herself, the Church of England may adopt those means of acquiring influence, diffusing opinions, and maintaining authority, which the Catholic Church so eminently possesses, and of which the former is obliged to acknowledge herself wholly deficient; and which, in truth, are the necessary and natural results of the divine authority which is vested in the Catholic Church.

Not ten years ago, the Anglican Church was fenced by legislative protection from all rivalry whatsoever. The repeal of the Test Act and the emancipation of the Catholics have reduced her ascendancy to a mere superiority in worldly advantages, and given to the people, for the first time, *the free and unbiassed exercise* of the *Protestant* right of judging for themselves in their choice of a religion. What has been the consequence? Already she is uttering the language of despair; already do her ablest champions proclaim that her only hope of safety is in the recovery of her exclusive privileges, and in the destruction of her Catholic antagonist by the secular arm. Nor is this all. She proclaims that, even though she should recover her former advantages, she can have no moral controul over the people unless by a new infusion of principles, and a re-organization of her fundamental construction; that, from the absence of these principles, and the errors in that construction, she has passed the end of her third century, without having acquired any hold upon the affections; or authority over the conduct, of the people. She proclaims that her new principles are to be derived from the Catholic faith; and her new authority is to be a *transfer* of that once enjoyed by the Catholic pastors to her own teachers. And lest, in her new garb, she should be confounded with, or mistaken for, the true Church, and the people, following up her new principles, and examining her new-born authority, should dis-

cover their source, and should prefer the original to the counterfeit, she has determined to follow the maxim of *odiosse quem læseris*, and, by every species of calumny and misrepresentation, to render hideous the features of her great original, so as to scare the people from any enquiry after the source of truth.

We are fully borne out in this view of the subject by her own authorities. In a former article\* we adverted to the "Tracts for the Times," by certain distinguished members of the University of Oxford. From the same source a third volume has lately issued, which contains a most remarkable combination of advocacy of Catholic principles and practices†, and an anxious longing for their introduction into the Establishment, with a calumnious misrepresentation of the Catholic religion. In the same spirit, but with greater eloquence and more extended views, a writer in the last number of the "Quarterly Review," has appealed to the Protestantism of the empire; and, to enable our readers to judge of the truth of our representation, we shall lay before them copious extracts, which we will endeavour to classify. The following passages, we are satisfied, will command the admiration of all our readers; and, by their Catholic beauty, will justify the length at which we quote them:—

"Our cathedrals were consecrated virtually by the spirit of their founders, and expressly in their charters, to the glory of God, and to the promotion of his glory, in a mode which to us may seem strange, though the Church, in her best of times—at all times, till nothing but utility engrossed our thoughts—esteemed it the greatest, and most natural, and most necessary of her duties. They were intended, not like our present churches, as lecture-rooms for teaching religion, or decent shelters against weather for the convenience of assembling on the Sabbath, but as great temples, where daily, and almost hourly, a solemn service might be celebrated to God, even if no worshippers were present but those by whom it was performed. The Church, in her best of times, never made, as we make, the preaching of man the first of her objects: she rested most on prayer; and, as in all other cases, what she received from the authority of her first teachers, and naturally adopted by the instinct of her own pure spirit, was, also, most consistent with reason. Even as an instrument of christianizing man, prayer is better than preaching. Prayer requires the active exertion of our own minds; preaching places us at our ease, to be moulded and fashioned by an outward influence. Preaching fixes our thoughts on man, prayer upon God. Preaching may make us vain, conceited, and judges of our teachers; prayer leaves us humble and contrite. We sit during the one, we kneel at the other. Preaching is precarious, and its power in human

\* Vol. i. p. 256.

† Our Catholic Readers will be edified by a complete translation of the Catholic daily office for "a confessor," adapted to the Life and History of the Protestant Bishop Ken.



words; prayer never can fail, and the answer to it is always at hand. Preaching is the help of ignorance; prayer the exercise of faith. Preaching may come home to our hearts; prayer takes us from our hearts into a better world and better thoughts. Preaching may bless ourselves; prayer is the means of blessing thousands.

"But the Church had other views of prayer than as a spiritual exercise for man. 'The knowledge is small,' says Hooker, in that beautiful fifth book of his Polity, 'the knowledge is small which we have on earth concerning things that are done in heaven. Notwithstanding, thus much we know, even of saints in heaven, that they pray. And therefore prayer, being a work common to the Church, as well triumphant as militant, a work common unto men with angels, what should we think, but that so much of our lives is celestial and divine as we spend in the exercise of prayer?' And it was to set forth the pattern of a celestial life upon earth, however we may have fallen from its spirit, or debased God's service to a form, that men who entered deeply, far more deeply than ourselves, into the gloriousness of Christianity, planted throughout the land, and resolved to perpetuate for ever, communities of its ministers whose business and profession should be prayer. They wished to reserve some spots where man, free from the trammels of the world, might live in his natural state of constant communion with his Maker. They knew, that over the great part of the world men's sins make the very heavens as it were of brass, that the dews of God's blessing cannot pass through them; and they kept open, in the midst of each nation, some accesses to God,—some of those golden ladders of prayer by which men's hearts ascend to him, and his bounties descend upon us. They heard with an ear of faith, which in us is deaf or lost, the songs of all created things, morning and evening, rising up before the throne of their Creator; and they thought it shame that no voice should join them from men, his own chosen children. And they kept up their communion with angels and past generations of saints, and the host of spirits, with which they were about to dwell, by uniting their hymns of praise in time, in spirit, in the very words themselves, with the praises and thanksgivings of a world above.

"For this purpose they consumed the labours and accumulations of lives upon fabrics worthy of such a service. They did not build, as we do, for the pleasure of man, running up thriftily and meanly every part which was withdrawn from his view; but, as if the eye of God were even on the hidden stones,—as if it were a work of love, in which no speck or flaw could be endured, they wrought every minutest portion as God himself, for his own glory and the luxury of our senses, has wrought out the embroidery of his flowers and the plumage of his insects. They embodied the mysteries of their faith in the form of its temples; so that an eye of thought might reach some familiar truth even in their seeming deformities. The spire—

'Its silent finger pointing up to heaven,'

the massive tower, emblem of the stronghold of God's truth; the triple aisles, the cross of the transept, the elevation of the altar, even that remarkable peculiarity almost universal in ancient churches, the inclination

of the chancel from the nave—all had their meaning. The very elements and shapes of their architecture, which they seem to have seized by some instinctive sense of beauty beyond what art could learn or teach, to one who owns the real though secret sympathies between man's eye and his heart, are full of thought and feeling. God, who knew what was in man, and made the outward world to soothe his eye and to feed his mind, has worked in every leaf, and throughout the whole range of nature, with just such moulds, and thrown forth his creations of beauty with the same spirit breathed upon them. It was not that art, in some caprice of fancy, slavishly copied the lofty bowers and canopies of the forest, and made from them a temple for religion; but God framed the canopies of the forest to breathe religion into the hearts of his creatures; and when religion took possession of their heart, the outward creations of their eye instinctively fell into those forms which nature had made congenial to their feelings.

"And in these glorious buildings, perfected—as far as the work of human hands can be perfected—by a consummate art, which the prodigality of a boundless zeal supplied, the Church willed that her daily homage should be paid to God, and her songs rise up to heaven with a certain pomp of devotion, and especially with the harmony of music. She wished, amidst the general frailties and cold-heartedness of man, to secure and perpetuate in certain spots those natural observances of heart-felt piety, which, if our nature was perfect, would be our hourly occupation and delight in every place. It is natural, and therefore right, for man to approach his Maker as he would approach an earthly sovereign, with nothing of sordidness or neglect, with more than decency, with much of splendour; not, perhaps, when he comes alone and as a penitent sinner, but when he stands before God in the company of that church which is the representative of God upon earth. It is natural, and therefore right, that the overflowings of devotion should take that form and be accompanied with those indulgences in which all such affections delight, and which create in others the feelings from which they flow in ourselves."—pp. 232-234.

Thus we have seen what is "natural, and therefore right, for man;" but strangely is it in contrast with the practical results as exemplified in the Anglican Church:—

"When we stand beneath those vast and gloomy columns, and see how few are gathered together, and those, perhaps, the paid ministers of devotion, the thought suggested is, not that religion is a form and its service hypocrisy, but that in all its beauty and all its splendour it is *alien to the heart of man*."—p. 235.

Our readers who have witnessed the crowds who frequent the foreign cathedrals, will acknowledge that it is in Protestant England alone that religion has ceased to be "natural and right," and has become "alien to the heart of man."

Bearing in mind the views of this writer as to the real utility of establishments, which "are coeval with the conversion of the country to Christianity, and *were the gift of individuals, and not*

of the public," (p. 205) let us next follow our Protestant authority into the principles which ought to protect "the funds left by private individuals for the use of future generations":—

"They are simply these:—

"First, That all funds shall be held sacred and inviolable, and beyond the reach even of the supreme power of the state, *until they are abused*, or the end of their creation becomes impracticable.

"Secondly, That when they are abused, the state, as the last appeal, shall interfere; but, cautiously and gradually, *to restore the use*, and nothing more.

"Thirdly, That when their end is impracticable, the state may again interfere to direct their application, not by itself, but by their trustees, *to some other purpose bordering as closely as possible on the original intention of the testator.*"—p. 201.

Doubtless these principles have always been applied in the Anglican Church. Their champion shall inform us:—

"Let them turn to the preambles of the statutes which were passed for the robbery and destruction of ecclesiastical corporations under Henry VIII. Let them remember how carefully he collected and *invented every monstrous calumny* against the smaller religious houses, before, in the preamble of the first statute, it was possible to rest their suppression upon the ground of incurable depravity. Let them endeavour, as he did in the case of the larger bodies, though by every act of *cruelty and extortion, to obtain a voluntary surrender* of their property."—p. 206.

Well may he exclaim—

"We have no concern whatever with the utility or inutility of institutions until we are assured *that they ARE OURS* to dispose of. And woe to the honesty of the man and of the nation that dares to cherish any pleasant dreams, even of benevolence, to be realised *with the property of others.*"—p. 201.

After this illustration of the foundations of the Anglican establishment, we turn with interest to the results of her guidance of the spiritual helm; and they are furnished in abundance.

"An urgent want is felt for *improvement* in her *religious system* ... *a long, lurking sense of weakness, and want of faith in the power of the Church has paralyzed resistance*, and suggested a temporary compromise." (p. 198.) One of her bishops "is striving to wipe out the deep disgrace of a *heathen metropolis* in a Christian nation." (p. 199.)—"The ruin which threatens all her institutions has come in through breaches and neglect in her parochial system; and, unless some gigantic effort is made, and speedily made, to widen, and strengthen, and multiply it, our end as a nation is at hand." (p. 200.)—"To the neglect and decay of its (the cathedral establishment) functions, she may attribute nearly all her *present disorganization* and danger; and to their re-

vival . . . she must look for her RESTORATION to *vigour and safety*, especially in her parochial institutions." (p. 209.) "The destitution of her parishes is but a symptom of an *internal disorganization* in some other part, . . . which has arisen from the inactive existence, the torpor, the alienation from *their original purposes* of her cathedrals." Her ecclesiastical corporations, "if useless in their full organization, are more useless when mutilated and helpless. They may *linger for a few years*, but their end is certain. They will become *impotent and contemptible*, and *the Church impotent and contemptible with them*; and then BOTH will FALL." (p. 231.) Well may Dr. Philpotts exclaim, "that in THIS CHURCH ONLY is the promise of forgiveness of sins." (*Charge*, p. 44.) But to return to the present state of the Church:—"A large portion of that population [viz., that of any single manufacturing or commercial town or mining district], the sinews of our national strength, is left ungratefully in a *state of heathenism*—of heathenism, perhaps with the single exception that they know they ought not to be heathen." (*Pusey on Cathedral Establishments*, p. 160.) "Discord, and insubordination, and irreligion, are preying upon the very heart of the country; and Romanism is steadily waiting till she is weakened by the contest to recover her members under its dominion." (*Quarterly Review*, p. 250.) Why Romanism should not be weakened by the SAME contest, or why her deprivation of the same and greater cathedral establishments has not rendered HER "impotent and contemptible," our author has omitted to explain. By most of our readers no explanation can be required. But perhaps our disjointed fragments but inadequately represent the true state of the Anglican Church; we will therefore do our author justice by longer citations:—

"There is no hope of making the right organization of the Church intelligible, or its true spiritual efficacy an object of interest to those who regard it only with a secular eye; and, excepting the clergy, few of those from whom support can be obtained in the legislature seem to regard it with any other. It has been always the crying sin of statesmen to deal with the Church as their tool or their enemy. It must be neither. The Church, indeed—not merely the clergy, but the whole body of the Church—can do, and will do, essential service to any sound political party—will save the nation for them, when no other arm can save it; but it must be by working out steadily, and independently, and quietly, its own religious system; by the infusion of its own spirit into the people; by holding up its own principles and character as a light from which the lower parties of the world may kindle their fires. But this is the only mode. The *power* of the clergy, as an official body, is *very nearly gone*; over a great mass of the population, from the deficiency of our Church establishment, it has never been able to extend; and where,

but a few years back, it exercised a prescriptive and hereditary influence, the new temper of the age has substituted, not dislike or disrespect, for to say this, for the most part, would be false,—but a personal attachment to the virtues and talents of an individual, instead of a devotion to the society which he only represents. When the true principles of Christianity and its essential form, ecclesiastical union, have been REVIVED and made known, it is possible that the official influence of the clergy may revive with it. But the natural and only mode of REANIMATING it at present, is personal influence and affection. This is one reason why every effort to preserve the Church on the part of its friends, even if the ultimate end be anything but the spread of pure Christianity, ought, even from political motives, to be directed to its spiritual improvement. Watch over its ministers, guard its doctrines, extend its ministrations, circulate the Bible, make it, *as far as the influence of the state can make it*, a pure, and holy, and elevated body, free from all low and unworthy subserviency; and it will become, in the hands of the state, what God always intended it to be, an arm of gigantic power for preserving our civil polity. But corrupt it, or permit it to remain, safe, indeed, in its outward privilege, but with no increased power in its inward spirit, and it will be a dead paralyzed limb, which a political party will be afraid to abandon, though compelled to drag it on with them—*a useless and mischievous incumbrance.*—pp. 209-10.

“ With the decay of humility, and obedience, and social attachment in the state, the same principles have decayed in the Church. Individual independence has run out into extravagance, and the spirit of mutual controul, which is the great connecting bond of all social systems, has been *nearly lost*. It is needless at present to enter into all the causes of this perilous and threatening evil. Among them have been the constant appeal to PRIVATE REASON made through the art of printing, and the circulation of books; the withdrawal, for the most part, of oral instruction; the gross flatteries addressed to *intellect* and *an enlightened age*, by very ignorant or very criminal leaders; a neglect to rest the defence of the Church against dissent on its proper logical and Christian ground of *antiquity and authority*; ignorance of the history of past ages, sanctioned by the vanity and conceit of our present physical science; an excessive application of excitement and feeling to rouse religion in the mind; and a dread of reverting to papacy, or, rather, the natural inclination to that ultra-protestantism which erects a papacy in the bosom of every individual. We must add, *indolence in the clergy, timidity in many of their leaders*, and a political jealousy of ecclesiastical power, which has suppressed all its ancient modes of incorporating, and exerting its authority in synods and convocations. And all these causes would long since have *dissolved* the Church of England as a body, and broken into fragments of dissent both its *form* and the *truths which it has to guard*, but for a few counteracting influences. It has been held together by old *hereditary prejudices* in favour of the Church of our fathers, by *political passions*, by *local associations*, by the natural *aristocratical spirit* of Englishmen, by the possession of more real attainment and sobriety than has prevailed among the dissenters, by an

occasional exhibition of ecclesiastical law and episcopal discipline, however rare, but mostly by personal attachment to a body of parochial clergy such as no nation in its happiest times ever was blest with before. But in all this there is very little, or rather nothing, of that loyal, dutiful patriotism to the church and its parental authority, apart from the authority of its ministers, which is the true spirit of Christianity, and which we require to see infused through it, into all the analogous relations of the citizen to the state. Whatever is our present outward unity, and real aversion to dissent, if the very *firmest adherents to the Church were polled to-morrow, there would be found in thousands by whom the charge of dissent would be repudiated with indignation, the very principle and poison of dissent, only prevented from working into action by some casualty which a moment may remove.* Throughout the nation, from the top to the bottom, there is one undisputed clamour for an *unbridled* right of private judgment, in defiance of all human authority. And where this is the case, it is vain and silly to talk of attachment to the Church, of Christian faith, of any other virtue, civil or religious, which is coupled with humility, dutifulness, and obedience. It is vain and silly to think of preserving either the Church or the state from *rapid dissolution*: as vain as if a man should hope to keep a mass of earth together when he had taken off the law of gravitation. We are at present a *ball of sand*, held together by an extraneous pressure, or chance affinities; and until that vital, informing, and vegetating spirit is *re-infused* into our hearts which will hold us all together by an internal obedience and common sympathy, our *existence is a mere casualty.* We may cut off the bough of a tree and replace it again, so that no eye can detect the separation; but the bough dies, and the first wind blows it down. And all the limbs of our social body, both ecclesiastical and civil, have been secretly severed from the trunk by the conceit of individual authority; and though, as yet, they are held together by a cramp, a few years, and the first storm will show their fate.

“And men's eyes are opened to the fact. Why is there such a stirring in the Church to bring back her ancient records, and revive long-dropped claims? Why is her authority, and the discipline of her forms, put forward by one class of her adherents (cautiously or incautiously, we are not now inquiring), and received by another class with so much alarm as if they led to that popery from which they are as far removed as the constitutional monarchy of England from the despotism of Morocco? Why, even, was the Commission itself established, and its anxiety to strengthen our parochial system made the grounds for such fearful innovations, but that all men alike acknowledge the approach of a crisis, and all see and feel the danger of the Church, and all understand that the danger arises from something in her *internal constitution*? And one weakness there undoubtedly is—in her parochial system; yet not the greatest, not the most vital, not the first to be remedied; but one which will be easily remedied, if another more fatal and more entirely beyond the hope of cure—should our cathedral institutions be destroyed—is first removed. We do not question the zeal of the Commission. We acknowledge the greatness of the evil which they have kept before

their eyes. We will go all honest lengths, and must refuse no sacrifice to remove it. But we lament bitterly over what cannot but be called—we would use the words without any disrespect—the short-sightedness and thoughtlessness in which an infinitely greater evil has been overlooked, and is proposed to be perpetuated for ever, that a smaller may be partially palliated—that *a few more years of lingering existence may be eked out for the Church in feeble and scanty pittance, instead of pouring new life and energy into her very heart, and reanimating her whole gigantic stature to live and to labour for ever.*”—pp. 213-15.

“One point is suppressed and another exaggerated, and the meanings of words, however strict, are gradually loosened and obliterated, and, by the necessary liberty allowed to a minister, opportunity is given of totally altering, in the course of his preaching, the whole character of his church doctrines, and even of Christianity itself, though without any deliberate intention or even consciousness of the fraud. In addition to this common tendency of imperfect human nature, which cannot be removed, a preacher has peculiar temptations to contend with. He is necessarily brought into contact with a variety of speculative opinions. His very zeal will be a hindrance to that sober, and comprehensive, and balanced view of truth, which is necessary for a complete development of any body of doctrines. He has, in the present state of pastoral duties, little, very little, time for study and reflection. He is, and must be, to a certain degree, dependent upon his congregation for reputation, if not for income; and few minds are wholly proof against the seductions of popularity. If he courts them, it will be by a sacrifice of truth; if he resists, it will very often be attempted by exaggeration. And, lastly, placed as he is in an almost irresponsible authority, and led to create for himself a personal influence, as the first mode of bringing men into the bosom of the Church, there is a danger, which we know from experience not to be visionary, of fostering a *schismatical presumptuousness*. A general view of the present state of the Christian Church would clearly show this case. It exists to a considerable extent in portions of our own community. One party suppresses one doctrine, and another its converse. One is inclined to take liberties with the words of the Liturgy, and another misinterprets their meaning. Many popular and zealous preachers have been instrumental in encouraging dissent, even in sanctioning it; and not unfrequently have seceded themselves. In the great dissenting communities, whatever efforts have been made against it, the most *fervent orthodoxy has, to a very deplorable extent, settled into Unitarianism*. In Ireland, where the Chapters have little or no weight, the connexion of discipline between the bishop and the clergy has been proportionably weakened; and the main safeguard for purity of doctrine lies in the hostility to Romanism.”—pp. 217-18.

“But Church loyalty is not only an integral and primary part of Christian virtue, and the best fund on which to draw for the maintenance of the Church, it is also, especially at present, the *main pillar of her doctrinal truths* to her people at large. (!) So long as these truths were rarely disputed, or disputed only by a small and often contemned body, or were supported by the strong unhesitating sanction of those

*temporal powers*, to which common men look for guidance in spiritual as well as civil conduct,—so long there was no need of incorporation of the Church to support her doctrines, or exhibit visibly her moral, and intellectual, and temporal strength in the aggregate, as legitimate authority for the correctness of her judgment. Men were then retained in the Church, as in other communions, by *habit*, or *prejudice*, or *indolence*, but *mostly under the influence of the State*. They found their religion established, and THEREFORE believed it to be true. It can now scarcely be said to be established; and we require some *other* reason, not for educated men, who find it by patient research in the catholicity of her doctrines, and the sanction of primitive antiquity, but for common men, whose natural doubts are to be swayed, and their good prejudices supported, by a palpable array of power which they can understand and respect.”—p. 224.

“We have permitted an enormous population to grow up without its walls, and beyond the reach of the ministrations of religion. Villages have swelled into towns, and towns into cities; and whole regions, deserted and unknown in past days of Christian zeal—barren moors and mountain valleys—have been seized on by that Mammon whom we worship, and converted into hotbeds of the human race, forcing every day into existence squalid, degraded beings, to be used as men would use a spade or pickaxe, without check against the torture of their bodies, or one thought for their souls. In the mean time, we have been living on peacefully, and, therefore, inactively, fancying that the wealth of the Church was sufficient to supply all its wants, and, instead of seeing in the efforts and extension of dissent, a proof of some defect in ourselves, lamenting over it as extravagance, and perhaps treating it with contempt. Thus the field which we neglected has been seized on by others, who have carried into it views of Christianity more striking and attractive to ordinary minds than the sobriety and moderation of the Church; and have roused a spirit of wilfulness, by the nature of their doctrines, and by clamours against the vices of an establishment which failed in the discharge of its duty. . . . We acknowledged that there was much which the Church had not done, and which we fancied it could not do; and were satisfied that the gospel should be preached, though out of our own communion. And let it be added, the general ignorance of ecclesiastical history and polity, both which subjects had naturally lain untouched during the safe establishment of the Church, *left us wholly without defence* against the pretensions of other sects.”—pp. 237-8.

“But we are too conceited to be really wise, and, least of all, to be really learned. And in theology, of which the whole basis and superstructure is learning, as distinct from general information and cultivation of mind, we are sadly in the dark. But the Church is placed at this crisis between great enemies—Romanism and Ultra-Protestantism; and the only weapon with which either of these can be encountered is learning—an extensive knowledge of antiquity, accurate researches into history, profound scholarship. The great strength of Romanism is her appeal to antiquity; and the deepest historical knowledge is requisite to prove that her corruptions are novelties. And the primary source of



all the heresies of Ultra-Protestantism, through every shade of theology down to the most perverse Socinianism, is the conceit of ignorance ; and this, also, can be corrected only by learning. We have suffered this generation to be reared up, as if, like the dreaming Autochthones, they had sprung out of the ground, had no ancestors, had received no inheritance, were the first of their kind who ever walked erect on the earth, or gazed upon the light of the sun. We have rarely ourselves referred them to the judgment of wiser ages, or acknowledged that allegiance which every wise and good man is proud to pay to the accumulated experience of antiquity : and the end has been such as we might have expected. When the only arbiter of truth, from which there can be no appeal, has been set aside, the opinions of all men and all parties are reduced to a level ; no guide to truth is left but an arrogant private judgment, or the infallibility of our own reason ; and when this has failed, nothing remains but a dreary universal scepticism. *Scarcely any man out of the bosom of the Romish Church now dares to speak as if he were sure that he is right.* Our liberality is mere weakness ; and our hesitation to charge others with error scarcely more than ignorance *whether we ought to convert them, or be converted ourselves.*—p. 221.

Such, then, is the result of the state-supported experience of 300 years in the Anglican Church ! But, perhaps, her Irish sister has a different account to render of her talent. Let us hear the voice of her champion :—

“ It was intended as a missionary church, with an establishment adequate to that increase which, with proper care and energy, it would soon have reached. We know that its work has not been done ; and those who propose to destroy it, take its past failure as a proof of its perpetual uselessness. The experiment, they say, has been tried, and not succeeded. We answer, that it has not been tried. What were the outcries against the abuses of the Irish Church, so common in the mouth of this party before the present race of active zealous clergymen grew up in Ireland ? Were they true or false ? Was the Irish Church employed as it should be ? Were all its ministers resident and active ? Were its funds so administered as to provide for a Protestant clergyman by the side of every Romish priest ? Were there no political passions to keep up religious antipathies, and so to prevent conversion ? Did the Protestant Church, in the person of its laity, assist the efforts of the clergy by their presence and authority, and, above all, by their kindness and tenderness to their estranged population ? All these are necessary conditions for the success of the trial ; and until they have been combined with the mere name of a Protestant Establishment, the trial has not been made. The bishops of Ireland should be called on by the country at once to leave their position, as the mere retainers of church property for the benefit of their own members, and take up the true vantage-ground, from which they should never have descended, and cannot be driven—the ground of a missionary institution. Let them put their church at once into a missionary organization, and infuse into it a missionary spirit.”—pp. 243-4.

We have thus presented to our readers a sketch of the actual condition of the Anglican Church. We have shown, that until 1828, she leaned upon the crutch of her exclusive privileges, so as to present an *appearance* of soundness and stability. We have shown that the removal of her crutch has exposed her weakness and her inefficiency,—have shown that she is liable to become “impotent and contemptible” (p. 231), even by the partial appropriation of a part of the property of her cathedral establishments towards the extension of her parochial system; while she admits, that without such establishments, and even in spite of them, her Catholic rival is neither “impotent” nor “contemptible,” but (with what truth we shall not here enquire) “is steadily watching till she (the Anglican Church) is weakened by the contest, to recover her members under its dominion.” (p. 250.) If we ask for an account of this phenomenon, Dr. Pusey will inform us of “the negligence of years” in the clergy (*Remarks on Cathedral Institutions*, p. 1.), or he will refer us to the fact “that the Protestant churches have neither places of education, nor retreats for men of mortified tempers” (*Ib.* p. 88.); or because “one fortnight now comprises the beginning and the end of all the public instruction which any candidate for holy orders is *required* to attend previously to entering upon his profession” (*Ib.* p. 25.); “and the great majority of the candidates reside *only for the single fortnight*” (*Ib.* p. 26.); or “because her ministers learn their duties *empirically*, while endeavouring to perform them . . . undertake duties which they do not understand . . . and are exposed to prefer the world and the flesh to their duties, *because* they have not been adequately taught in what those duties consist.” (*Ib.* 31-2.)

Mr. Sydney Smith, however, will possibly give us a different account. He will tell us, that “the Church of England is unpopular, not for the lack of prebendaries, but for their idleness” (*Letter on the Ecclesiastical Commission*, p. 11.); or it may be, because of “the partiality, rudeness, and oppression of the bishops;” because, “he has seen clergymen treated by bishops with a violence and contempt which the lowest servant in the bishop’s establishment would not have endured for a single moment;” or “because, if there is a helpless, friendless, wretched being in the community, it is a poor clergyman in the country with a large family; if there is an object of compassion, he is one.” (*Ib.* p. 42.) Possibly, Dr. Philpotts may afford the true solution of the difficulty. “We have all (he says) been too neglectful of the obligation of instructing the people in the real nature of Christ’s Church, and the duties resulting from it, both to the ministers and the people.” (*Charge*, p. 42.) For our

parts, we think the solution may be given in a very few words :—The Church of England is not the house whose foundations are dug deep, and laid upon a rock. (*Luke vi. 48.*)

We now proceed to the consideration of the remedies which are proposed for the existing admitted deficiencies of the Anglican Church. They are,—*First*, The removal “of the want of some visible incorporation of the Church itself” (p. 223.); “the *reincorporation* of the Church;” the “*creation* of the spirit from which her supplies are to flow;” “the construction of a new body” (p. 225.), “to be the depositories of truth, stationed throughout the country.” (p. 220.) But we must narrate the wants of the Church in the eloquent language of her own able advocate:—

“The first end and object of the Church, as an incorporation under the authority of God, is not to make men moral or religious, nor even to spread the knowledge of God himself; but to guard and preserve against a constant tendency to corruption a certain body of truths in which that knowledge is contained. Such a notion may be very foreign to an age in which, for religious truth, and, indeed, for all truth in itself, one half the world professes to care nothing, and the other not to know where to find it. Still, the first great work of the Church is to be a *witness and pillar of the truth*; and whoever knows anything of human nature and its universal tendency to pervert and obliterate all the high doctrines of Christianity, will acknowledge the necessity of guarding them by a very artfully-constructed body, which may serve as the glass shade to a lamp, —suffer the light to pass through it unobscured and untinged, and secure it at the same time from being blown out by the caprices of human reason.”—p. 215.

From what quarter, then, our readers will ask, is the reconstruction of the Anglican Church to be looked for? What are to become her “new depositories of truth”?

“Some will say, in canons, and articles, and subscriptions. But no one who knows anything of human nature can be ignorant that all these are a mere dead letter, wholly in the power, and subject to the modification, of human reason, without some *security elsewhere*. Others look to episcopal authority. But let any sober-minded spectator of these times ask himself if Episcopal authority, in the present temper of public opinion, and in the divided state of the bishops themselves, could hold out against a rapid and general corruption of Christian Faith by their subordinate ministers?”—p. 218.

The real remedy, then, “exists or may be created by careful appointments in her cathedral bodies. . . . If they have fallen into disuse, where has been the fault? Can we afford any longer to let their functions lie dormant? Is there any difficulty in *reviving* them? Will they not prove the greatest—THE ONLY—securities to episcopal authority in any coming crisis, whether from without the Church or from within it? and

are they not the *natural remedy* for the evils so often lamented over—the *decay* and *impracticability* of a stricter ecclesiastical discipline? Remove them, and place nothing in their stead, and leave each bishop by himself to regulate the movements of his clergy within the Church, and resist the attack from without, and how will they be able to resist the storm which is gathering round us?—p. 220.

Surely the Church here described cannot be serious in applying to herself the promise of Jesus Christ to be with her “all days, even to the end of the world!”

Unhappily the Reviewer has omitted to explain the operation by which the members of his new “depository of truth” will be less “divided” than the bishops,—less a prey to “schismatical presumptuousness” than the parochial clergy,—less “a ball of sand,”—less “held together by a cramp” than the body of the laity.

So much for the *first* remedy. Her *second* consists in a determination to make a vigorous assertion of her right to all the spiritual authority ever claimed by the Catholic Church. But we must content ourselves on this topic by referring to the “Tracts for the Times,” and to Dr. Philpotts’ *Charge* (pp. 42-6.) To what extent, however, this assertion of rights will be admitted by the “heathen population” of the country, may possibly be conjectured from the admission “that thousands of her *firmest adherents* have imbibed the principle and poison of dissent, which is prevented from working into action by some casualty which a moment may remove.”—p. 214.

The *third* remedy is *time*, “that she may REGAIN her position in the hearts of the people and in the COUNCILS of the LEGISLATURE. (p. 240.) But how is this time to be employed? In the RECONQUEST, or the “CONVERSION!” of Ireland,—in obtaining “a transfer of the DEPENDENCE of the peasant from the Romish priest to the PROTESTANT priest and laity combined!” (p. 247),—and in removing “the great obstacle—the Irish Romanists—from the House of Commons, because they cannot be admitted to sit in the legislature consistently with... the integrity of the Church of England” (p. 240);—in bringing about “the future watchword of conservatism”—“the repeal of emancipation” (p. 240), or “the repeal of the Union!” But let our author speak for himself:—

“We may struggle (the words will of course seem MADNESS! but we believe the hour is coming when they will once more become the watchword of conservatism) to repeal the emancipation. There is one more chance of saving the country from the tyranny of an Irish faction—the repeal of the Union: and these are the only plans open. They ought to be faced boldly, and a line taken at once. And the sooner men speak

out the better. But whatsoever course presents itself, the same preliminary step occurs as indispensable in each. Ireland is, at this moment, the curse of England, as England, we grieve to say, for many years had been the curse of Ireland. It is one of those strange coincidences of retribution, which Providence often exhibits to show that there are eyes upon our sins, however long the punishment is delayed. *And Ireland must be either set adrift from us to be reconquered, or it must be converted.* You cannot reduce the number of Romanist members, except by reducing Romanism itself; and you cannot exclude them from parliament while Ireland is still in their hands. Let us repeat the words, however startling,—the only safety, and therefore the first object, of the English Church, must be the conversion of Ireland . . . *personal safety alone*—the safety of all that Englishmen value, compels the attempt. . . . The PRESERVATION of the Church of England, and the EXISTENCE OF ROMANISM in Ireland . . . ARE WHOLLY INCOMPATIBLE.” —p. 240-1.

“Their religion is a plague to themselves (the Romanists), as it is a curse to this country. The Romanism of Ireland is the *plague* of Great Britain. If it be otherwise—IF Popery BE consistent with civil liberty and the welfare of a country—IF it be not the deadly bane of man’s greatest blessings, and the bar against all his improvements, we have indeed made a discovery, and we had better return to Popery throughout the kingdom.”—p. 243.

We have thus endeavoured to sketch the remedies which are suggested for the *re-incorporation* and reconstruction of the Anglican Church; we have developed her fears and her hopes; we have shown that those fears are essentially based upon her envious jealousy of the Catholic Religion; that those hopes are directed to its destruction, and a transfer of its authority and influence. What farther clue do we require to the conspiracy to which we have adverted, and to the propagation of the charge of treachery and perjury by the Anglican Establishment against the most prominent members of her dreaded and hated rival? That conspiracy will never succeed. The Power which has maintained the Catholic religion within these realms during centuries of persecution, will support it against the assaults with which it is now threatened; and if the fears of the champions of the Church of England shall be realized, and she shall become “impotent and contemptible, and shall fall,” (p. 231), the Catholic Church will be a city of refuge for her defenceless members.

---

ART. XI.—1. *Affairs of the East, in connexion with Russia and England.* Second Edition. Ridgway.

2. *Metropolitan Magazine, February 1834.*—Article, *Turkey.*

3. *Russia and Turkey.* By Urquhart. •London. Ridgway.

THE intense interest excited by questions of domestic policy, often diverts the public attention from a due consideration of foreign affairs; and when the scene is far removed, and the effect not immediately felt at home, events of great importance pass without attracting notice, or creating alarm. Our relations with Turkey were either neglected or misunderstood, until affairs in that empire had reached such a momentous crisis, that it was no longer possible for us to shut our eyes to the danger, or be indifferent to it. The supposed weakness of the Sublime Porte, and the threatened dissolution of the Ottoman power, were the first causes which awakened Europe to an interest in the East, for empires attract more attention in their rise and fall than during their intervening years of steady prosperity. From the period when Suleiman added the last conquest to the Ottoman empire, until the year 1763, when Catherine waged successful war on Turkey, the history of the Sultans excited little interest amongst Christian powers, and seldom interfered with their international arrangements. No sooner was the tide turned which threatened to inundate all Europe, than the arms which had been prepared to repel Mahomedan invasion, were employed to settle the petty differences and minor affairs of Christendom. The attention of statesmen was no longer turned towards the east, as the point where the storm gathered and the tempest grew. Constantinople and its Mahomedan possessors were left in peace and neglect, till the giant power, which had silently grown to maturity in the far-north, cast a desiring eye over his southern frontier, and longed to exchange his ice-bound home for the sunny banks of the Bosphorus.

The grand struggle began inauspiciously for Russia: Peter the Great was defeated on the Pruth, and though the Empress Anne was more successful in the field, her victories were annulled by the disadvantageous peace of Belgrade.\* The Russians, however, had seen the Euxine, and felt the milder climate of the Crimea. The court of St. Petersburg had learnt the policy of busying discontented minds with foreign war, and in the ears of the ambitious Catherine no music sounded so sweet as the roar of her own victorious cannon.

---

\* Peter the Great seized upon Azof in 1686; he was beaten on the Pruth in 1709. The peace of Belgrade was concluded in 1739.

Count Munich was the first who conceived the design of adding Constantinople to the Russian dominions. A long banishment had not quenched his martial ardour, nor could old age efface the daring schemes he had meditated in his younger days. On his return from Siberia, he flattered the royal imagination with the prospect of a southern empire. Catherine lent a willing ear to his ambitious councils, and from the impression they then made upon her, may be traced the numerous wars and innumerable battles which afterwards took place between the armies of the Czarina and her Mahomedan neighbours.

The Western powers either doubted the practicability of Munich's plan, or were ignorant of the consequences of it to themselves. France paid court to the Empress, while England did then what she does now—see the danger, and take no effectual means to avert it.

In 1768, Turkey drew her sword in defence of Poland, and if her success had been equal to the justice of her cause, Europe would not have had now to mourn over the unnatural death of one of her bravest nations. The gauntlet so nobly thrown down by the Porte was eagerly taken up by Russia. Her policy had but one object in view, and there was little likelihood of her deviating from it. The design so boldly conceived by Count Munich was followed up by Catherine with an equally bold execution. Not an opportunity was allowed to pass by—not an excuse, however paltry, neglected—for extending the southern frontier of Russia, and approaching the great end of her ambition.

The Crimea was conquered—the Ottoman fleet burned at Tcheshmè, and the Ottoman army defeated at Chumla. Fortune seemed to be chained to the standard of Catherine, and what was at first considered as a mere day-dream of the recalled exile, began by degrees to assume a palpable shape. Each successive campaign evinced the debility, or rather the premature old age, of the Turkish empire. Young and neighbouring states began to look with longing eyes on the lovely realm which had been held so long a captive slave by her Asiatic conquerors. Russia and Austria were growing in strength and size, and both burned with the same ardent lust of conquest. Constantinople excited their cupidity, and became the subject of mutual rivalry and jealousy. Each power held itself prepared to seize the fair captive the moment she should fall from the feeble embraces of her Mahomedan master. The peace of Kaynardji in 1774—the peace of Constantinople in 1784—the peace of Jassy in 1792—were the strides by which Russia approached the completion of her designs. The ill-advised war of 1788 was the injudicious

and ineffectual step which Austria took to obtain a share in the spoil.

The Western powers watched the battle rage, but dared not enter the lists. France seemed to be blind to her own interests, until the master-mind of Napoleon foresaw the evil in its full extent, and preferred to encounter the hostility of Russia, rather than purchase her friendship at the price of Constantinople.

Individuals in England began to mistrust our neutral policy in the East, and the great Lord Chatham has recorded his opinion on the subject: but the nation in general were not sufficiently acquainted with the character of Turkey, or the resources of Russia, to comprehend the question in its full importance.

The French Revolution, moreover, so completely engrossed the attention of England, that the more distant affairs of the East seemed to be matter of minor consideration. When, however, Napoleon made his descent upon Egypt, and threatened the British empire in India, our true policy was found to be in a close alliance with the Sultan, and our chief safe-guard in his power of resistance. The Mamelukes were dispersed by the Republican army, but, assisted by English ships, the forces of the Porte drove back from the walls of Acre the till then invincible army of Napoleon.

Egypt was rescued by England from France; but the convulsed state into which Europe was afterwards thrown, broke through the bonds of ancient friendship, and placed natural allies in deadly enmity, the one against the other. The balance of power was overthrown, and England forced into the unnatural position of a friend of Russia. The very hero who had rendered such powerful assistance to the Porte at Acre, joined with Sir John Duckworth to destroy the Turkish fleet, and pass the Dardanelles. Constantinople, however, was summoned in vain, and all the advantage which accrued from the passage, was the knowledge of their strength.

Russia did not slumber the while: with sure and stealthy pace she held due on her course, and never took her eye from the great object of her wishes. Upon the possessor of Constantinople she knew depended her own power in the Mediterranean. Master of the Dardanelles, she would possess an advantage which no other maritime power on the earth enjoys. Her arsenals would be beyond the reach of a hostile fleet, while the Euxine and Marmora would serve as basins to train and organize her men.

These considerations had due weight with Napoleon, and, at a later period, did not escape the forethoughtful mind of Canning. The independence of Constantinople was as much a principle in



the policy of the former, as it was the object of all the unsuccessful negotiations of the latter. Napoleon promised to pay tribute to the Sultan : he made the Mahomedan declaration of faith, and tried to flatter their religious zeal : but instead of exciting a spirit of propagandism amongst the Musselmén, he drew down on himself a severe condemnation of his own apostacy. Brave as well as just, the Porte declared, that the lawless conquests of France were in opposition to the precepts of the Koran, and that *they* could do little honour to the true prophet who had so recklessly forsworn their own.

Europe should remember, that of all the nations involved in the wars of Napoleon, Turkey alone was not bribed to join in the partition of other countries by the promise of spoil ; and England in particular should recollect, that when an attack upon British India was pleaded as an excuse for traversing Egypt, the Porte considered the very avowal of such an intention as sufficient grounds for declaring war against France. The Divan, while it never interfered in the internal commotions of other countries, invariably raised its voice against external aggression. It tried, though in vain, to protect Poland ; and with equal justice pleaded on behalf of the once hostile, but now fallen, Republic of Venice. The flattering prospects held out by Napoleon failed to delude it, and the horrible scenes enacted in Paris could not tempt it to break faith with the nation. The Porte held good her treaties with France, whether governed by her king, or ruled by the Directory. It cannot understand a war of opinion, and neither made Republican proselytes like France, nor was haunted like Austria with the terror of Liberalism. The unambitious character of the Turks, as well as their principle of non-interference, suit them particularly for the important post they hold in Europe. In any other hands, the advantageous position of Constantinople would be turned to the purpose of aggressive wars and selfish emolument. It requires a stable government and upright policy like the Porte's, to form the pivot on which the balance of power in Europe is poised. The slightest bias towards either scale would destroy the equilibrium : if the Sultan had joined Napoleon in the East, he would have laid bare all Asia to the French armies : if he now closes the Dardanelles at the will of Russia, he neutralizes the maritime influence of England and France in the Mediterranean. It is the impartiality of the Porte which entitles it to hold the keys of Europe and Asia : it is the circumstance of its having no marriage connexion—no links of religion or language with Christian powers, which suits it to be the permanent barrier between the rival pretensions of European potentates. The Sublime Porte neither courts an Imperial bridegroom

for the daughters of the seraglio, nor enters with sectarian zeal into the struggle between Catholic and Protestant. This isolated position, which the Turks hold in the great European family, qualifies them for the neutral ground they maintain, and makes their independence a guarantee of peace between the opposing parties—between the military governments of the north-east, and the popular states of the west.

Returning to the history of Turkey, in the year 1806 we find the Sultan again at war with his insidious enemy—Russia. The splendid embassy of Sebastiani threatened to wren the Porte entirely over to the side of Napoleon; but whatever was the influence that minister obtained with the Divan, Russia had no excuse for continuing in Moldavia after the Hospodars were restored in the principalities. With equal injustice, and far greater folly, England made her unsuccessful expedition to Constantinople, and her still more absurd attack upon Egypt. Notwithstanding the assistance rendered to Russia, Russia forsook England; and, in spite of the wrong done to the Porte, the Porte never joined the Continental system. Shaken by internal convulsions, as well as external attacks, Turkey still persisted in her independent policy, and eschewed the great coalitions of the European states: she neither excluded English commerce from her ports, nor marched in the ranks of Napoleon to the taking of Moscow. Luckily for Europe, though perhaps contrary to her own feelings, Turkey made peace with Russia, when the opportunity of a full retaliation seemed to be at hand. The peace of 1812 terminated the part which the Ottoman armies performed in the great struggle between France and the rest of Europe.

In reviewing the conduct of the Porte during this momentous period of European history, justice must acquit the Divan of any gross violation of faith, or base subserviency to the predominating power. The line Turkey selected for herself was one of strict neutrality; and although great temptations were held out to join one of the belligerents, she avoided the arena until obliged to take up arms in self-defence.\* When the injustice of her allies forced her to come into the field, she did so without fear, but at the same time without much prospect of success. She had to struggle in turns against France, England, and Russia; and, although overmatched in each case, obstinately contested the battle. Pronounced by Europe to be at the point of death, she evinced a vitality which both astonished and disappointed her self-constituted heirs. If in one year her armies were dispersed,

---

\* Compare the decrees of the Porte at the beginning of the French wars, as well as during the occupation of Egypt, with the notes of the Russian Ambassador and his English Allies.

they rallied again in the next; and her fleets, though destroyed, were soon renovated, and again afloat. The empire, which was so often torn to pieces by internal dissensions, as often resumed, as if by magic, its former solidity. When the nation was said to be utterly ignorant, the Porte issued the most eloquent manifestoes; and when the treasury was supposed to be ruined, the government had not incurred a single debt. The authority of the Sultan was daily set at defiance, and yet the Ottoman dynasty was the oldest in Europe. Other countries changed and changed again the line of their monarchs, while on the throne of Turkey, to Amurath an Amurath succeeds without question of right, or interruption of descent. The most extraordinary men have risen in the provinces; but, while they proved by their energy the resources they could command, they equally evinced by their fall the impossibility of overthrowing the reigning family. Ali Pasha, the Pasha of Acrc, and a hundred miniature copies of these original characters, emerged from obscurity, revolted against the Porte, and again sank into nothing.

The anomaly which Turkey thus presented, attracted curiosity; and, in proportion as the rest of Europe became quiet, this still-distracted quarter excited attention. A host of travellers hurried to the East, but few of them tarried long enough to become acquainted with the country. Observing the corruption which had grown like ivy round the fabric of Turkish institutions, they never examined the pure but solid architecture which stood concealed beneath. Many mistook the breaches of Turkish law for the law itself, and have set down the ignorance of a *cadi* for a defect in the Mahomedan code. Crude, and often incorrect, accounts of the customs and laws, character and domestic habits of the Turks issued in rapid succession from the press; but the information they contained scarcely kept pace with the curiosity excited. Recent events in Europe had so familiarized men's minds with changes, that they looked with surprise on the slow progress and sturdy spirit of conservatism in the East. There the old system, though overgrown with weeds, stood erect on its solid basis. No new constitution, or plan of centralization, had reached the independent municipalities of Turkey; but the very antiquity of the Ottoman rule was set down as an earnest of its overthrow by the lately revolutionized states of Europe. The attempted alterations of Selim III, as well as the riots in which he first lost his throne, and afterwards his life, were merely forms of discipline, and noways affected the fundamental institutions of the country. There was no wish to change the dynasty, and no effort to proclaim a constitution. The spell which bound the Ottoman Empire together was still a secret, while the most acute

observers could not account for the obstinate adhesion of its heterogeneous parts. Some attributed it to the ignorance of the rajahs, others to the fanaticism of the Turks; but all agreed that this extraordinary unity was about to be speedily dissolved. Nations, who themselves had shivered like reeds at the touch of Napoleon, proclaimed the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, while the attention newly directed towards that quarter of the globe was considered as a symptom of approaching decay rather than a proof of actual importance. With one voice Europe predicted the downfall of Turkey: its dismemberment was speculated upon as an inevitable event, and foreign powers were accused of looking out for their share in the spoil.

Though Turkey had suffered less mutilation during the wars of Napoleon than many European states, she could not dispel the clouds which still continued to gather round her political horizon. Russia was still her all-powerful and implacable enemy. Poland had ceased to exist. France, her natural ally, had played her false in Egypt. Austria, perhaps her best friend after all, had been so beaten and exhausted, as to become, in self-defence, the servile follower of Russia. Prussia was then, as she is now, the humble squire to the same power; while England had unfortunately lost her name for justice or policy by her ridiculous expedition to the Sea of Marmora. The internal state of the empire held out no more flattering prospects than the external relations. The Janissaries lorded it in the capital, while the feudal chiefs reigned paramount in the provinces. Ali Pasha ruled in Albania, and the cities of Mecca and Medina were in the hands of a rebel sect.

Such were the circumstances which warranted the prophecies of Christendom, and made the commencement of Mahmoud's reign an awful crisis in the history of Turkey. Even amongst the faithful some desponding spirits were found, who proclaimed that the hour was almost arrived when the kingdom of Othman must pass away; and the haughty race who had humbled the city of Constantine, return exiles and fugitives to the shores of Asia. Gloomy, however, as was the prospect which opened before the Moslems of Europe, it neither curbed their wonted pride, nor destroyed their apparent indifference. The same belief in predestination, which had tempered their joy in the hour of victory, enabled them to contemplate, without repining, a reverse of fortune; for, instead of giving themselves up to a bootless despair, they awaited, with stubborn resignation, the approaching storm.

Under these unpropitious auspices, Mahmoud II assumed the regal dignity. In the seclusion of the seraglio, he had listened

to the instructions of Selim, and adopted the opinions of that unfortunate monarch; but while the dethroned Sultan found a ready listener to his lessons of policy, he was unable to impart to his pupil the gentleness of disposition which had characterized his own career; for Mahmoud imbrued his hands in a brother's blood almost as soon as the sceptre was placed in them. The subsequent years of his reign have been consistent with the commencement of it: he has never allowed compassion to interfere with his policy, or forsaken a hazardous undertaking in consequence of the danger attendant upon it. Emerging from the retirement of the seraglio, he found himself at the head of a nation which was distracted to the very heart by civil broil, and seated on a throne which had lately been deserted by its most ancient allies. On him, moreover, devolved the entire task of national regeneration, for the people were either too apathetic or too resigned to make any effort of themselves, or stem with resolution the current of events. It required a bold and reckless spirit like Mahmoud's to make head against the torrent of national prejudices, and nerves like his to play the hazardous game of innovation—a game in which he staked his whole fortune on a single throw, and in which one retrograde movement must have proved fatal. Mahmoud, however, fearlessly undertook the dangerous task, and, luckily for him, success crowned the first efforts of his reign. By persevering courage, or well-timed treachery, he dispelled the clouds which darkened the political horizon, and, in doing so, he received the most able assistance from his present rival, Mahomet Ali. The Mamelukes were destroyed, and Egypt reduced from a state of anarchy to a peaceful as well as productive province. The rebellious Pashas bowed in succession to the imperial authority. “The dere-veys were extirpated, the wahabs punished, and the keys of the holy city laid at the feet of the Sovereign.” Mr. Urquhart, from whose work we have quoted the last sentence, continues—“It required the most complete prostration of natural haughtiness to enable Turkey to emerge from her former torpor, and radically to cure her political disorganization.” In Mahomedan pride and the reserved character of the Turks, a barrier had been raised which separated them from the rest of Europe, and excluded from their knowledge the progress of society. Proud and contemptuous, they boldly asserted their individual importance, while they compromised the national integrity. Disdaining to receive instruction from foreigners, they fell into the rearward of civilization, and, while bravely defending the last rampart of ancient prejudice, were fairly out-manceuvred by modern tacticians. Mahmoud saw the evil, and determined to strike at the root. A mind of extraor-

dinary firmness alone could undertake so hazardous a task; but the Sultan has not only had the firmness to undertake, but the perseverance to accomplish it. The qualities he brought to the task were very different from those which distinguished his predecessor Selim. Bold and relentless, Mahmoud cared little what means he employed, provided he at length attained his end. The centre of all evil, the seat of the disease, was in the insolent pride of the Janissary corps. They set at defiance the power of the Sultan, and refused to submit to military discipline. Their courage in the field was undisputed, and on their fanaticism depended the defence of the frontier; but as long as they were in existence, and dictated to the Divan, it was impossible that either civilization or public order could be introduced or established in the Ottoman Empire. Their annihilation, therefore, became a necessary part of Mahmoud's policy: on it he set his heart, and the efficacious manner in which he executed it excited the horror as well as surprise of Europe. In the course of a few hours, the power which for so long a period had wielded the destinies of Turkey, was not only overthrown but swept from the face of the earth. The state which the country was thrown into by this unexpected though necessary blow, would have appalled a less intrepid mind than Mahmoud's; but he not only advanced in his hazardous undertaking, but advanced with little assistance, and in spite of the greatest opposition. Fanaticism, though checked at the fountain-head, was not entirely dried up, and many an old Mahomedan looked on the Sultan's reforms as so many departures from Islamism. Every reverse experienced by the Turkish forces was considered as an evidence of the Divine wrath; and even the few who followed their sovereign in his daring progress, pursued the path of reform with fear and diffidence. Distant nations considered the measures of Mahmoud as tending to precipitate rather than retard the downfall of his empire, and many a false prophet announced the Sultan's overthrow as an inevitable consequence.

To the neighbouring nations, who had imperfectly studied the history of Turkey, the destruction of the Janissaries, as well as the numerous innovations which followed that event, appeared as an attack upon the fundamental institutions of the country, and a shock to the very base of Ottoman greatness; but the native statesmen, who had watched the disasters of Selim's reign, knew full well that the empire could never be restored to its pristine vigour until the abuses which had encumbered its form of government were completely eradicated. They knew that the work of destruction must precede any attempt to rebuild, and that if Selim had acted upon this principle, his numerous reforms

would have stood a fair chance of succeeding. Self-government and municipal rights form the very life and soul of the Turkish institutions ; but when Mahmoud ascended the throne, each province had erected itself into an independent pashalick, and claimed political as well as municipal authority. Anarchy in the first place, and military despotism in the second, were the natural results of the insubordination of a province, and the certain sequel to its throwing off its allegiance to the Porte. Most of the pashalicks, from Scutari in Albania to Kurdistan and Bagdad, had reached the second phasis of the revolution, and were either subject to the unlimited influence of a wealthy family, or trampled under foot by the irresponsible power of a single individual. To restore them to the sway of the Sultan was to restore them to liberty ; but as their governors generally possessed both a treasury and an army, the undertaking required both time and force. The entire Turkish population bore arms, with the exception of a small district in Asia, which paid a tax in the place of military service ; but though they were bound in duty to march at their sovereign's command, they refused to obey any orders but those of their immediate leaders. When the chiefs rebelled against the Sultan, the troops invariably joined the revolt, because the pay of the soldiers proceeded directly from the provincial treasury, instead of being remitted, as it now is, from the central government. Corruption had wormed its way into every department of the state, and the very conduits of prosperity and wealth were choked up by the accumulated neglect of years. Mahmoud undertook to cleanse the Augean stable, nor has he as yet reposed from his labours. The annihilation of the military hordes in the mountains, and the disarming the inhabitants of the cities, as well as the subjugation of independent Pashas, and fixing permanent limits to their delegated powers, composed only a part of the herculean task. The authority of every corporate body in the state required to be limited and defined ; for they, as well as individual chiefs, had overstepped their original privileges, and encroached upon the royal prerogative. The whole system of finance demanded a revision, and the collection of the revenue a new and more equitable arrangement. The principle of farming the taxes was doomed to be entirely abolished, and with it the power of purchasing the command of a province, and sub-letting its income to an Armenian banker. In spite of Selim III's failure, the Sultan proposed to encourage the sciences, and even introduce the fine arts. He determined to extend education and establish a free press in the capital. Coeval with these peaceable reforms, an entire army was to be levied, organized, and put on a European footing, while equal, if not greater, improvements

were to be introduced on board the fleet. A militia was also to be raised throughout the empire as a depot from which the army was to be recruited, while military colleges were to be erected for the officers and engineers. This is only a faint outline of the mighty work Mahmoud undertook to achieve: the boldness with which he conceived his plan was only equalled by the perseverance with which he labours to accomplish it. Again and again has disappointment followed his brightest expectations, but he has been neither disheartened by the failure nor induced to abandon the project. Success, however, has crowned many of his efforts; and if others have fallen short of the anticipated result, the falling off is attributable to foreign interference rather than to any deficiency in the measures themselves. Unshackled by his diplomatic relations, the Sultan would have advanced rapidly in his reforms, but the intrigues of European Powers have, from time to time, thwarted his purposes. Although his throne has occasionally been maintained by the quarrels of the Christian States, it has also been threatened by their combined attacks. Notwithstanding, however, the clash of arms, and even the humiliation of a defeat, he holds on his course, and never loses sight of his object. The reformation of his people is the goal which he labours to attain, and towards it he advances even when obliged to fight foreign enemies with the one hand, while with the other he suppresses domestic troubles.

The first interruption he experienced was occasioned by the war with Persia, which was of serious consequence in Asia, but scarcely affected the immediate neighbourhood of the capital. The second check which the Sultan received in his progress was of much greater importance, and almost proved fatal. The Greek revolution was not so formidable in itself as disastrous in the foreign interference it entailed; but even judged as a mere act of internal insubordination, it presented greater difficulties than the Sultan was willing to allow. It was not, as the Porte pretended, the revolt of a single province, but an insurrection which spread throughout one half the kingdom. Of the various people over whom the Sultan reigned, the Greeks ranked second in importance to the Mahomedan nations. Their claims to independence were undefined both with regard to extent of territory and forms of government. No schoolboy recollections limited their ideas to the revival of Sparta and Athens, nor could the mere prospect of being governed by a fellow-Greek in the Morea, tempt the Asiatic rajahs to an unprofitable emigration. Their ideas of emancipation were as desultory as the warfare by which they endeavoured to achieve it, and, considering their municipal privileges, the Turks might be reasonably puzzled to



discover the motive of their rising. The Greek communes enjoyed the right of electing their own chiefs or elders; and what is still more, the election was conducted on the principle of universal suffrage. The duration of office depended on the will of the people, and no qualification, except popularity, was required in the candidate. To these elders or betters the municipal government of the villages was entrusted, while to them was also confided the assessment and collection of the taxes. The Greek religion was not only tolerated, but even protected by the Turkish government: their convents and colleges were endowed by a royal charter, and in some of their towns Turks were not allowed to reside. It must be stated, however, that there were exceptions to this general rule, and that in some of the provinces the rebellious pashas invaded the constitutional rights of the rajahs. This partial injustice, and the intrigues of foreigners, induced the Greek nation to rise throughout the empire, and risk their vast and valuable possessions for the mere name of national independence. The struggle which followed, and the bloody scenes which accompanied it, form one of the blackest pages in the history of the Levant. Bad as was the conduct of both parties, the Christian surpassed the Mahomedan in the hollowness of his faith and the brutality of his revenge. In the west of Europe, however, schoolboy prejudices, a love of liberty, and religious zeal, painted the contest in very different colours. Thieves and pirates were extolled into heroes and patriots, while such scenes as distinguished the taking of Tripolitza, were considered as a mere holocaust offered at the shrine of liberty. The insurgents repaid the sympathy of Europe by the plunder of their merchant vessels and the ill treatment of the crews. While receiving assistance from the Catholic King of Bavaria, they were persecuting with rigour the Catholic inhabitants of Syra; and while appealing to the liberal party in Europe, they were exhibiting amongst themselves every species of intolerance. It is painful at the present time to allude to these melancholy subjects, but we trust that the possession of their independence, and the enjoyment of liberal institutions, will eventually restore the Greeks to a position in the scale of nations more worthy of their ancestors.

By a strange inconsistency, the Porte was called upon to suppress the piracy of the Greeks, and, at the same time, to acknowledge the independence of that people. By a still greater contradiction, the high powers waited till the insurgents were reduced to the last extremity, before they stated their doubts as to the Sultan's capacity to terminate the insurrection; and absurdly came forward to arrest the effusion of blood, when all the blood which was likely to flow had already been spilt. It is true

that the Porte had treated the revolution too lightly in its commencement, and had not employed efficient means to arrest its progress; but the Sultan was confident of the ultimate result, and foresaw that the advantages which would follow the struggle, would, in some degree, repay the disasters which had attended its progress. The indolence of the Turkish population had been greatly encouraged by the activity of their Greek fellow-citizens. Unless war summoned the Osmanlees to arms, they wasted their entire time on the divan or in the bath, while the Greek rajahs cultivated the fields and carried on the trade of the country. Their men-of-war had invariably two distinct ship's companies; the one consisting of Greeks to work the ship, the other of Turks, to fight the enemy. In the time of peace the government derived neither profit nor strength from its Mahomedan subjects, for they consumed without producing the necessities of life, and allowed their arms to rust on the shelf without paying the Karatch, or poll-tax. In war they earned their exemption from the tax, but for want of regular training they mustered more like a disordered rabble than a disciplined militia. The Greek revolution roused the Turks from their apathy, and compelled them to rely on their own exertions for their future subsistence. They then, for the first time, studied the laws of navigation, and applied their hands to the labours of agriculture. Their unsuccessful efforts at first betrayed the long years of inexperience; but necessity proved to be a skilful master, and in length of time the Turks were able to exist without their Greek assistants.

The Sultan in the meanwhile continued the war in the Morea, and after six years of alternate success and reverse, finally triumphed in his object. The insurrection was virtually crushed, and he was able to dictate his own terms of peace. The last years of the war had afforded occupation to the army of Mahomet Ali, and called forth the military talents of Ibrahim Pasha. The ravages, however, committed by each party had been so general, that little besides deserted plains and forsaken villages, remained in possession of the conquerors. To colonize the country, and raise on the site of Sparta an Arab population, was the plan suggested by Mahomet Ali, but before the scheme met the approbation of the Sultan, the battle of Navarin completely altered the aspect of affairs.

Left to itself Turkey would now have advanced rapidly in civilization and strength. The Janissaries were no more, and the nucleus of a disciplined army was already formed. The Mahomedans began to manœuvre their ships as well as work their guns. Agriculture was encouraged by the sovereign, and

commerce received an increased development. New laws were promulgated which tended to equalize the subjects of the Porte and restrain the power of the Pashas. Property was rendered more secure, and the old system of confiscation entirely abolished. Orphans and minors were put under the protection of government, and rules for the conduct of their guardians permanently prescribed. The Sultan had mastered in succession the discontented parties which surrounded his throne, and the peace of the capital was no longer endangered by a riotous mob or a lawless soldiery. The insurrection in the Morea was nearly extinguished, and the Greeks who returned to their allegiance, were offered in return their former municipal rights. The Porte made no distinction for or against any portion of its subjects, but threatened with the utmost severity those who should continue to deny its authority. Full pardon on the other hand was offered on full submission, and the protection of the government was now something more than a mere promise. Provinces were no longer put up to auction in the market of Constantinople, but a governor appointed with a fixed salary, and answerable to the Porte for his conduct. The system of farming was discontinued, and with it the power of life and death taken away from the Pashas. The whole system of provincial government had been altered, and the people were beginning to feel the advantages of the change. Ibrahim and his army were occupied in the Morea, and not a word of revolt or assertion of independence had escaped the lips of the Egyptian ruler.

Such were the successes achieved by Mahmoud, and such the brightening prospects of the Porte, when the European Powers interfered and signed the fatal treaty of July. That treaty, which, if strictly enforced, would have permanently fixed the boundary of Russia, was converted by that crafty power into a source of further insult and ruin to Turkey. The Court of St. Petersburg pledged its word then, and at a subsequent period renewed it, not to seek territorial possessions or selfish accession from Turkey; but instead of adhering to her promise, Russia has seized upon the mouth of the Danube, and claims at the present day the entire coast of Circassia. The real object of the treaty has thus been evaded, and the tedious negotiations which preceded it, rendered entirely null. Its final ratification did not take place till the insurrection was virtually suppressed, and the greater part of the people had made their peace with the Sultan—when the islanders only dared to encounter the merchant-vessels of friendly nations, and the Mainotes under Mavromikali, fled before a handful of Ibrahim's troops. The professed intention of the high Powers was to stop the effusion of blood in the Morea, but

the first act of their combined fleets was to crimson its shores with additional slaughter. It is useless now to dwell upon the "untoward event," but in justice to Ibrahim and Tahir Pashas, we will give a succinct account of the circumstances which immediately preceded the action, as well as the Turkish version of the result.

On the 17th of October, 1827, a detachment of Ibrahim Pasha's army advanced on Kalamata, a town situated at the extremity of the gulf of Coron. On the approach of the Turks the Greeks left the town, and bending their way by the seashore, retreated towards the village of Kitries. Midway between the two towns, the mountains approach so near to the coast, as only to leave a narrow strip of land at their base. In the narrowest part of this passage, at a place called Ancyra, the Greeks, under Mavromikali, threw up a wall of loose stones and anchored two gun-boats off its seaward extremity. The ground between the position and Kalamata, was chiefly occupied by olive-trees, which, from the time required in their coming to maturity, form the most valuable possessions of the Greeks. To prevent an ambush and allow their cavalry to act, the Turks proceeded to destroy the trees and clear the ground of all obstruction. The Greeks made no opposition, and the Turks did not fire a gun, but the smoke of the burning trees attracted the attention of Captain Hamilton, who, with the *Cambrian*, *Philomel*, and Russian frigate, *Constantine*, had entered the gulf of Coron. After sending an ineffectual message to the Turks, and distributing bread amongst the Greeks, Captain Hamilton rejoined the Admiral off Navarin, and reported to him the proceedings of Ibrahim Pasha. Those proceedings were considered contrary to the previous engagements of the Turkish commander, and afforded an excuse for the combined fleet to enter the harbour of Navarin. The sequel is well known, but as the party most incriminated in the affair has not yet been heard in his own defence, we now lay before the reader the spirited and correct letter of Ibrahim Pasha.

On the 29th of October, Captain Puget, commanding his Catholic Majesty's schooner, *La Flèche*, entered the harbour of Navarin, and at six o'clock in the evening had an audience of Ibrahim Pasha. After the usual civilities, Ibrahim requested the French officer to take down his words, and slowly spoke as follows:—

"Sir, I wish the conversation I am about to hold with you to be faithfully and minutely reported to Admiral de Rigny; and having expressed this wish, I rely on your honour for the exact fulfilment of

it. I am misrepresented and calumniated. 'Ibrahim,' they say, 'has broken his word.' The following, sir, are the circumstances on which this false accusation is grounded. A short time previous to the unfortunate affair of the 20th, I had a conference with the English and French admirals, in presence of many of their officers. We there came to a verbal agreement, that an armistice should take place between the Greeks and Turks until an answer had been received from the Porte with regard to the proposals of the high powers. I asked if I could provision Patras, which place was then in great want of supplies, and I received an answer that there would be no hindrance to my doing so. I farther demanded if I could defend my convoy, in case it was attacked by the Greeks; to which question the English admiral replied in the negative, but at the same time offered an escort or safe conduct to my vessels,—a proposal which I declined, as contrary to the honour of my flag. A short time after the squadron had left the roads of Navarin, I despatched a convoy for Patras, and, as I had heard the Greeks were in that quarter, I sent a few men-of-war to protect it. I ask you, sir, if I ought to have acted otherwise, and have allowed my brothers in arms to die of starvation. Receiving, however, farther intelligence that Lord Cochrane threatened Patras with a considerable force, I set sail in person, and ordered several frigates to accompany me, hoping by this show of force to prevent a collision, and secure the safe arrival of my convoy. In the meanwhile, the vessels which had preceded me had fallen in with the English, and, in consequence of a summons from them, were returning again towards Navarin. Meeting, therefore, my convoy on its return, I called a council of my officers, and debated with them on the necessary steps to be taken. After a full consideration of the subject, I proceeded to execute my original design of provisioning Patras, as by so doing I did not violate any engagement with the allies, or undertake any enterprise against the Greeks, who at that time possessed no land in the neighbourhood. I was then proceeding in this direction, when, again met by the English, and again receiving a fresh summons from them, I determined to return to Navarin, and abandon for the present my original project.

"I had returned, and again left Navarin for some days, when the English, French, and Russian squadrons hove in sight. A frigate and an English brig entered the harbour without showing their colours, and, after making several tacks in the bay, again left it without hoisting a flag; conduct which I can neither justify nor account for. On the 20th, the pasha who commanded in my absence, observing the allied fleet bearing down on Navarin in order of battle, and with apparently hostile intentions, sent a boat on board the English admiral, and delivered to him the following communication; viz. that the pasha would be sorry to see so large an armament enter the port of Navarin during the absence of Ibrahim; but that if the allies had any occasion to communicate with the shore, they could do so with perfect security, and that part or parts of each squadron could enter without endangering

the peace. I appeal to you, sir—do you observe any thing calculated to give offence in a similar request? Was it not natural for the commander to object to the presence of so powerful a force, and protest against its entering the port, especially as that force was four or five times superior to the Turkish, and likely by its warlike presence to provoke hostilities? The English admiral sent back the boat with the insulting answer, that he came to give orders, and not receive advice; while the combined fleet continued to bear down on Navarin in line of battle. At two o'clock, P.M. the three squadrons entered the harbour, and immediately took up their berths within pistol-shot of the Turkish fleet. In the meanwhile a frigate detached itself from the fleet and anchored athwart two fire-ships which were moored at the mouth of the harbour: the French and Russian squadrons followed the English admiral, and imitated his manœuvres. The Turkish admiral sent a boat a second time on board the English flag-ship, to demand some explanation of these hostile proceedings; but the messenger was driven back in a manner equally insulting and unjustifiable, while the frigate above-mentioned sent her boats to seize on the fire-ships athwart which she had taken up her berth. At this moment a discharge of musketry took place, which proved to be the signal for a general action,—an action which was only terminated by the approach of night, and the utter destruction of our squadron. The Turkish squadron was composed of three line-of-battle ships, fifteen frigates, and several transports, and was not prepared for action; while the fleet which it had to contend with consisted of ten line-of-battle ships, besides a number of frigates and corvettes. This being the case, do the three admirals really think that they have reaped a rich harvest of glory, by crushing with their superior forces an opponent who neither expected nor had given cause for such an attack, and who was not prepared for action, nor had taken the precautions of defence?—But to return to the subject, and state who began the action, and who has the blame or merit of having fired the first shot. On this point each party is anxious to exculpate itself. What, however, is positively known on the subject is, that the English frigate, without reason or provocation, endeavoured to take possession of some fire-ships, and that the just resistance made by the fire-ships caused the first shot to be fired. To conclude, sir—being conscious of having given no offence, I avow that I am still ignorant of the motive which gave occasion for this unaccountable conduct. The high powers profess a wish to prevent the farther effusion of blood in the Levant, while, behold! their admirals crimson the waters of Navarin with blood, and cover the entire bay with floating corpses. I am told that I, Ibrahim, have broken my word; but I will go to Paris and to London, if necessary, and there make known the true case, when they who have shed this innocent and unoffending blood shall bear the blame and shame of their misdeeds. Ships are built to stand the hazards of battle and of storms—it is not their loss which so deeply afflicts me; but when they accuse me of breaking my engagements, I cannot refrain from asserting that it is a foul calumny.

Sir, I rely on you to repeat word for word to your admiral what I have just stated to you,"\*

This letter, dictated by Ibrahim, and translated by his interpreter, was delivered to Admiral de Rigny at Vourla, a small sea-port at the mouth of the bay of Ismir.

We will dwell no longer on the "untoward event," but we cannot refrain from remarking, that the Power which was so hasty to avenge the slightest offence when the offender was weak and unprepared, ought not now to hesitate when her flag is really insulted and her ships captured by a dangerous enemy.

We will consider the merits of the Circassian question before we close this article, but in the meanwhile we must return to the events of twenty-eight.

Mr. Canning's object was the preservation of the Ottoman Empire, as well as the political independence of the Porte. He wished to remove from Russia all pretext for making war, and to this end proposed himself as a mediator between the Sultan and the Czar. His negotiations were long and tedious; but instead of boldly insisting on Russia's forbearance, he invariably advised the Porte to further concessions. The Court of St. Petersburg, better informed on the subject than the rest of Europe, knew that the resources of Turkey were not exhausted, and that if Mahmoud were allowed to proceed in his reforms, he would become in time a formidable enemy to Russia. He had already begun to organize the power of his people, and the Emperor naturally watched with a jealous eye the successful commencement of so noble a design. To molest the Sultan in his arduous task, and, if possible, to attack the country during its state of transition, became the necessary policy of Russia; while the obvious interest of England was to strengthen the northern frontier of Turkey, and gain time for Mahmoud to accomplish his reforms. Instead, however, of boldly standing by the side of her ancient ally, England sought to appease the violence of Russia; and when she ought not to have acknowledged the exorbitant demands made at Ackerman, her ambassador even exerted his influence to induce Turkey to accede to them. No satisfaction, however, could check the ambition of Russia; it was in vain that Mr. Canning exhausted his influence with the Divan, for no sooner had the Sultan yielded on one point, than another subject of complaint was immediately raised against him. When

---

\* We received the French copy of this letter on board the French flag-ship on the same day that it reached Admiral de Rigny. With his leave we preserved the copy, and believe that only two or three copies besides our own were allowed to be taken.

the treaty of Ackerman was finally adjusted, and that topic failed to afford sufficient cause for offence, Russia turned her attention to the Greek revolt, and founded, on the outrages committed during it, a new motive for interference. She had been the alternate friend and foe of the insurgents, and one year condemned them as revolted subjects, and the next protected them as her co-religionists.

Fearing her single interference in the affairs of Turkey, Mr. Canning invited all the powers to join in the pacification of Greece, and hoped by this general alliance to restrain the designs of Russia. His plan was, however, frustrated, for Turkey was shocked at the unnatural coalition, while Russia only adhered to the treaty as long as it served her purposes. Austria had invariably shown a partiality for the Porte, and could not, without the grossest inconsistency, join in this crusade against her neighbour. Her empire, like the Ottoman, is composed of different nations and people of different creeds. The Italian, Bohemian, and Hungarian, had equal claims with the Greek to independence, and the Court of Vienna foresaw that if success attended the revolt of the Moreotes, the Poles would not be long in following their example. So complicated, in fact, were the relations between the negotiating parties, and so inconsistent their conduct, that the Sultan could neither rely on their faith nor fathom their designs. He heard England protest against Russia's aggression in the north, and saw her join with that very power in destroying his fleet in the south.

Puzzled by the conflicting and contradictory opinions of European powers, the Porte not only declined farther mediation on their part, but even protested against the interference which had already taken place. It asked by what international law one state allowed itself to assist the cause of rebellion in another, and described with a prophetic voice the consequences which might follow such a precedent. Appealing to the sacred law which offers protection in person and property to all loyal and peaceable subjects, it contrasts its own unofficial conduct and strict adherence to treaties, with the unsteady policy and false representations of the allies. This declaration is written with the clearness of language and firmness of purpose, which generally characterize the manifestoes of the Sultan, and proves that argumentative powers and oriental eloquence are not altogether strangers in the councils of the Sublime Porte. It denied the atrocities ascribed to its arms, and truly stated that foreign interference alone had prolonged the struggle in the Morea. Without the prospect of assistance from abroad, the Greeks would have submitted after their first reverses, and



accepted the forgiveness promised by the Porte to their repentance. The manifesto farther declares, that the war was neither one of religion nor extermination, for various nations were then living in peace under the Porte, and religious toleration was then, as it is now, the policy of the Ottoman Empire.

This appeal, eloquent and just as it was, made no effect upon the three Allied Powers. Canning could not forget his school-boy dreams of Greece, and his most Christian Majesty was not likely to draw his sword in defence of Islamism. Russia, the third but most influential party to the contract, had led her allies blindfold so long, that she knew they could not find their way back, even if allowed to see they had gone astray. Austria stood aloof, and Prussia, although she generally followed the political steps of Russia, escaped the charge of inconsistency, by imitating the neutral conduct of Austria.

Disgusted by the unwarrantable proceedings of the three high powers, and trusting that his rapid movements would outstrip their tardy negotiations, the Sultan boldly rejected all peaceful advice, and advanced in spite of remonstrance to the subjugation of Greece. The rising army of Mahomet Ali had nearly accomplished its task on shore, while the squadron of Tahir Bey was sufficient to complete the work at sea. Tranquillity was on the point of being restored throughout the Ottoman Empire, when the three powers interfered and signed the fatal treaty of July.

The death of Canning, which took place about this time, proved equally advantageous to Russia and detrimental to England. Relieved from the vigilant eyes of that statesman, the Emperor was able to mature his plans of invading Turkey, and break the promise of neutrality which the treaty of July imposed upon him. So completely contrary to the intentions of Canning were the events which followed his death, that the very treaty which was framed to keep Russia from her prey, proved the means of bringing it within her reach.

The twentieth of October realized more than the most sanguine enemy of the Porte could have calculated on, for that day not only witnessed the destruction of the Ottoman fleet, but caused the Divan to distrust in future the warmest professions of England. The moral injury done to the two western powers was still greater than the physical loss sustained by the Mahomedan arms, for from that hour the influence of France and England sank for ever in the Levant, and Russia, whether as friend or foe, rose paramount in the consideration of the Porte. Whether Canning would have been able to extricate his country from the labyrinth of difficulties in which he himself had led her, must ever remain a matter of speculation; but he who began the

game of intrigue was the most likely to play it to a successful issue; and it is probable, that, if the life of that daring statesman had been spared, Russia would not have ventured to act the unblushing part she afterwards did. He had bound her to neutrality, and to neutrality he would certainly have constrained her. As it happened, however, his untimely death, the indecision of Lord Goderich's ministry, and the "untoward event" of Navarin, so completely paved the way for conquest, that Russia could no longer resist the tempting opportunity. Forgetting all her professions of moderation, she boldly declared war against Turkey, and broke her engagements with England. The treaty of London became a dead letter; for, according to that treaty, she waved all individual claims, and refused to act as a belligerent in order to co-operate with the western powers, and come forward as a neutral flag in Greece. The allies had even entered into mutual arrangements with regard to the number of ships in the Mediterranean, and the seniority of commanders. No sooner, however, had the combined fleets destroyed the Turkish squadron, than Russia considers all engagements at an end, and begins offensive operations on the frontiers of Wallachia. Her forces in the south are augmented, her armies march into the principalities, and the treaty of Ackerman is again brought forward as an excuse to annoy Turkey. Right or wrong, it was the interest of Russia to quarrel with the Sultan: a more favourable opportunity for attacking him could not be afforded, for he had neither a fleet to send into the Black Sea, nor allies to give a moral support to his cause. The treaty of July appeared, in the eyes of the Turks, a combined attack of all Europe, and although the friendly professions of England might formerly have had some effect with the Divan, that effect was entirely destroyed by her subsequent conduct. Canning, in his negotiations with the Porte, had invariably insisted on the pacification of Greece, as the means of removing from Russia all pretext for going to war; but now that the Turkish power in the Morea was entirely destroyed, the Emperor availed himself of the panic for marching on the Danube. The Sultan appealed to the courage of his people, and determined not to fall without a struggle. Deserted by his friends, and deceived by the enemy, he boldly took the field, and fought single-handed with his powerful adversary. An opportunity was now offered to England and France to repair the injury done to Turkey, and retrieve their lost interest with the Porte; but instead of aiding their ancient ally, they allowed their natural rival to advance to the very gates of Constantinople. Throughout they had acted inconsistently: their conduct in Greece was scarcely that of a neutral flag, and

now, when the policy of Canning might have been brought into play, they refused to bind down Russia to her pacific engagements. It was in anticipation of this crisis that the treaty of July had been signed—it was to baffle the hostile designs of Russia that she was invited to join the high contracting powers in the pacification of Greece; but instead of keeping the Emperor to his word, the foreign secretary broke off negotiations with the Porte, and withdrew the ambassadors from Constantinople. Then, but not till then, the Sultan declared his distrust of the Christian powers—*then* he accused Russia of a conspiracy against the Mahomedan nation, and the other European courts of abetting her in the attempt. With energy, and not without reason, he called upon the faithful to rally round the throne, and resist with all their might the new crusade against them. This hattî-sherîf appeared in January, and its echo had scarcely reached the distant provinces, when the Court of St. Petersburg thundered forth its declaration of war. Few public documents contain so many words and so few arguments: the accusations against Turkey are, the molestation of Russian commerce, undue influence with the court of Teheran, maltreatment of the Servians, and a refusal to comply with the treaty of July. The three first of these injuries, on which Russia mainly relied for a justification for going to war, existed in no greater degree subsequent to the consultations in London, then previous to it: and yet, in the treaty she signed on the 6th July, she positively disclaimed any hostile intentions against Turkey. Was that treaty, or were the promises (written or verbal) which accompanied it, abrogated; or rather, were not France and England bound to enforce its fulfilment? They did so, as far as regarded Turkey, with the single exception, that in addition to forcing on the Sultan the virtual independence of Greece, they took from him the promised nominal sovereignty: but in respect of Russia, they overlooked her departure from the terms of the treaty, and allowed her to rove with as large a tether as she listed. She herself seemed aware of the insult she was about to offer to the Courts of France and England; for in her declaration of war, she alludes to the pacific character she had assumed, but protests against her temporary moderation having any reference to her earlier and more important rights. Those rights, if they really existed, had been in abeyance (even according to her own showing) during the last thirteen years; and it seemed rather more than mere accident which made the moment of the Porte's greatest embarrassment, the very moment that her patience should be exhausted.

Turkey answered the accusations of Russia by a positive denial of them. She had neither influenced Persia nor subjected

the Imperial flag to new exactions; but, on the contrary, Russia had adopted a vexatious policy for the purpose of causing a quarrel; and that if any party was guilty of mental reservation at Ackerman, that party was the Court of St. Petersburg.

England and France in the meanwhile proceeded to the execution of the treaty of July with little firmness or consistency. The combined squadrons, which had hitherto acted under the command of the English admiral, parted company, and espoused the individual interests of their own separate flags: negotiations with the Porte were renewed, although the relative positions of Turkey and England were precisely the same as when all communication with the Divan had been broken off; and, what must be considered as a self-condemnation of their precipitate flight, the ambassadors returned to their posts. The Morea was slowly evacuated, but not without force: Athens remained for some time longer in the hands of the Turks. The progress of Russia, though not so rapid as she expected, contrasted, nevertheless, with the tardy proceedings of England and France: all her treaties, all her promises, were broken in succession. By the treaty of Ackerman, she condemned the Greeks as revolted subjects—by the treaty of July, she recognized them as an independent nation: by her engagements with England, she was to seek no individual advantage; but when a fair opportunity of invading Turkey was afforded, she did not scruple to seize on the mouth of the Danube. Thereby she infringed the treaty, and insulted England and France. As some palliation for her breach of promise, she qualified her declaration of war, by confining her hostility to the northern frontier of Turkey, and waving her right as a belligerent in the Archipelago; but this engagement, like her former one, was apparently only made to be broken, for scarcely was the ink dry, when a Russian squadron blockaded the Dardanelles. At the commencement of the war, the Emperor expected to advance, with little opposition, to the capital of his enemy; but the reverses he sustained during the first campaign, taught him to set a higher value on his foe, or place less confidence in his own army. His language to England varied with the fortune of the war: while at the head of a numerous army on the Pruth, he professed his intention to preserve an armed neutrality in the south, but when driven back from the Danube, he acknowledged the necessity of the Mediterranean fleet co-operating with the army on shore. The military reputation of Russia was injured rather than enhanced by the war; for her long-prepared armies fell upon Turkey when the treasury was exhausted and the spirit of fanaticism quelled, before the raw levies were well trained in their new discipline, or the distant

pashas confirmed in their allegiance; while the wreck of the fleet still strewed the roadstead of Navarin, and Mahomet Ali treated with the English Admiral as an independent prince. Notwithstanding these disadvantages, Turkey resisted, during two consecutive years, the oldest soldiers and ablest generals of Russia. Before Ibrælon and Silistria, as well as in the celebrated siege of Varna, the army of the Emperor suffered losses which he had not anticipated, and which Europe imagined the Turks were incapable of inflicting. The first campaign closed without either adding laurels or holding out brighter prospects to the Russian arms; but the second began under very different auspices; during it the Turks showed little of their former zeal, and the Russians were in consequence every where victorious. Silistria fell; Paskevitch approached the capital of Armenia, and Admiral Greg threatened the coast of the Black Sea. The capture of a single frigate was the only laurel gained by the Capitan Pasha: while on land, the Grand Vizier was out-manœuvred by Deibitch, and defeated in the well-fought battle near Pavadi. Choumla still defied the Russian army, but neither the perseverance of the Sultan nor the bravery of his troops could make up for the treachery of his officers and the defection of his rajahs. The Balkan was passed without opposition, while the Pasha of Scutari, to whom the defence of Adrianople was entrusted, was lulled into inaction by the seductive promises of Russia. Had the Bulgarian population known the difference between the iron rule of the Czars and the mild government of the Porte, or the Albanian army foreseen the insulting manner in which Russian promises were intended to be broken, either Deibitch would never have passed the Balkan, or been annihilated the moment he had done so. Fate, however, decreed otherwise, and fortune violated the old adage, by leaving the intrepid Sultan and joining the ranks of his more subtle adversaries. The Pasha of Scutari proved traitor, and his sovereign succumbed. Then, and not till then, England awoke from her lethargy, and either allowed her ambassador additional powers, or else that ambassador took upon himself extraordinary responsibility. The Russian fleet under Admiral Ricord, was held in check by the English squadron under Sir Pulteney Malcolm; and if the former had made any attempt on the Dardanelles, the latter had received orders immediately to engage them. Under these circumstances Deibitch had no choice, but to sign an immediate peace, or rush to certain destruction beneath the walls of Constantinople. Delay would have proved fatal to his army, and the Russian General was too good a tactician to allow his momentary triumph to be annulled. Availing himself, there-

fore, of the Pasha of Scutari's inaction on the one hand, and the Sultan's ignorance of the Russian weakness on the other, he proposed the preliminaries of peace; and before the real position of the invading army was known, or the delusion under which the Ottoman generals laboured dispelled, the celebrated treaty of Adrianople was signed: a treaty by which Russia obtained more than she could have anticipated, when retreating in the previous year before Choumla and Silistria, but less than she might have demanded, if actually triumphant at the gates of Constantinople.

With the treaty of Adrianople began different, and hitherto unheard of, relations between the Court of St. Petersburg and that of the Seraglio. By it all the delusions which had blinded the rebel pashas were dispelled; and what was still more unexpected, all the confidence hitherto placed in England and France entirely destroyed. The two western Courts had left their ancient ally to struggle alone and unassisted through the entire war, and could, therefore, scarcely expect at the termination of it to be placed on the footing of their former friendship.

Thus was concluded, in the year 1829, the celebrated treaty of Adrianople—a treaty by which Turkey lost the virtual sovereignty of Wallachia and Moldavia, and Russia obtained the greatest commercial advantages in the East. The clause which makes Russian subjects amenable to their own consul, instead of the Turkish courts of justice, loses its obnoxious tendency by the impossibility of putting it into execution; but the enormous sum of money demanded as a compensation for the expenses of the war, being beyond the power of Turkey to pay, will always leave an excuse for Russia to renew the quarrel.

Mahmoud had not forgotten, nor did he intend to forgive, the treachery of his Albanian general; for no sooner was peace restored, than he visited on the head of his rebellious vassal the full penalty of his crime. The Grand Vizier was more successful against the revolted chiefs, than in the gallant but impolitic action near Pravadi. The Sultan's forces triumphed in Albania, and that warlike province became, for the first time, entirely subject to the central power of the empire.\* This short gleam of sunshine in the fortunes of Turkey, was soon destined to be succeeded by a darker cloud that had ever yet lowered over the throne of the Sultans. A storm had been long and silently

---

\* At the commencement of this civil war, and while the issue was still doubtful, the measures adopted by the Vizier were equally severe and decisive; but when the prospects of the rebels were reduced to a hopeless state, the government party tempered their courage with clemency, and added to the glory of victory by the moderation with which they used it.

gathering in Egypt, but Mahmoud could scarcely expect it to break upon him with such violence, or at so unfortunate a moment. Exhausted by his recent struggle with Russia, and anxious to repose on the few laurels gained in Albania, he turned his attention to the peaceful cultivation of the arts, and congratulated himself on the final return of order. His hopes of tranquillity, however, were soon dispelled, for scarcely had he tasted the comforts of repose, than he was once more disturbed in his peaceful pursuits, and his armies again summoned to the field. Mahomet Ali's successes were greater than even he could have anticipated, for, with the exception of Acre, Ibrahim Pasha met with no resistance in Syria. The Grand Vizier did all that courage could do, but the dispirited troops of the Sultan made no stand against the well-disciplined ranks of Egyptians.

What was the ultimate object of Mahomet Ali still remains a secret; but had he wished to extend his conquests to the walls of Constantinople, the Porte could have offered no effectual resistance. Town after town opened its gates to the victorious army, and the people of the conquered provinces seemed almost to welcome the invaders. The throne was in danger, and the Sultan saw no means of checking his rebellious vassal, except by applying for foreign assistance. To this end he sent an ambassador to the court of St. James's, but that court refused to move a step on behalf of its ancient ally. A single ship-of-war—the slightest demonstration on the part of England—would have caused Mahomet Ali to halt in his career: but neither England nor France seemed willing to retrieve their lost interest with the Divan. The effect of their apathy or indecision, was to flatter Egypt with the hope of independence, and force Turkey into the arms of Russia. The readiness with which that crafty power flew to the assistance of her late antagonist, was only equalled by the mock disinterestedness with which she had first recommended an application to England. Her grand object was now attained:—Turkey was bound to her not only by fear, but by gratitude—her flag floated in the Bosphorus, and her army was encamped in Asia. That she had stirred up Mahomet Ali to revolt, is more than perhaps we have grounds to assert, but under no circumstances could he have more effectually played the game of Russia. Her object had always been interference rather than aggression; and the political dependence of Turkey is more profitable to her than its military occupation. She has not the means to colonize it with her own subjects, nor the force to keep in subjection its heterogeneous population; but as long as the countries are bound to each other by an offensive and defensive alliance, Turkey becomes a permanent barrier against attack on the southern frontier

of Russia. With such an outpost as the Dardanelles, she may well bid defiance to England in the Black Sea, and subject to her will our commercial relations on its coast. By the treaty signed between Count Orloff and the Porte, on the 8th of July 1833, Russia and Turkey are bound to support and defend each other; but as the Sultan cannot easily spare an auxiliary force, the Emperor has substituted in its place the right to close the Dardanelles. He does not require his ally to send troops and ammunition to Russia, but modestly obliges him to shut the gates of the Black Sea, and thus render his whole southern frontier invulnerable. Such is the purport of the secret article in the treaty of Unkiar Skilessi—a treaty which, if adhered to by Turkey, must place her in the balance with Russia, whenever that power is at war with the other countries of Europe. Neutrality is out of the question: the Sultan must either break faith with the Emperor, by allowing a hostile fleet to pass the Dardanelles, or compromise himself by firing on the flag of friendly nations. But this is not the only advantage Russia gained by her encampment at Unkiar Skilessi, for the same treaty which excluded the ships of foreign powers, confirmed for her own the right of free passage both in the Bosphorus and Dardanelles. The treaty of Adrianople secured for the Russian flag the liberty to trade and carry, in any sea, or to any coast of the Ottoman empire, and the treaty of Adrianople is confirmed by the treaty of Unkiar Skilessi. The same privilege is extended to the ships of all nations, but as Russia is the only power which possesses a fleet in the Black Sea, her's is the only merchant navy which can navigate without fear of molestation. It is specified in the article, that *merchant-men* alone are to enjoy the right of free passage—but this proviso can only affect men-of-war coming from the Archipelago; because the treaty of Unkiar Skilessi obliges Turkey to afford Russia every facility and means of defence in her power—which passage must be interpreted as a permission to descend into the Mediterranean whenever it is to her advantage to attack her enemy's possessions in that quarter.

Thus, after years of successful wars, and still more successful diplomacy, Russia obtains her long-wished-for object—the virtual possession of the Dardanelles.

By it she has secured commercial advantages during peace, and a military position in time of war: the Euxine is converted into a Russian lake, and all the trade on its shores must eventually fall to her possession. Under the name of *lazarettos* she builds fortresses; and, under pretence of sanitary precautions, she excludes all strangers from the coast. "The great game of diplomacy," to use the words of the writer in the Metropolitan, "was



now fairly played to the 'last card:' England, France, and Russia, were the parties engaged—the alliance of Turkey the stake played for. Chance seemed to favour the western powers, but, either from the skill of their antagonist, or their own bad play, Russia rose the winner. From this period the political relations of the East were completely changed, and the balance of power overthrown. Instead of a dangerous enemy for its neighbour, the court of St. Petersburg has strengthened its southern frontier by a powerful friend; and the same stroke of policy which extends the influence of Russia, strikes, at the same time, a death blow to English ascendancy.

These being the results of Count Orloff's mission, Russia may well boast that she gained more by mediation than she had previously obtained by arms. What Russia gained, England has lost. The time is gone by when her name acted like magic on the policy of Europe. She has professed too much, and done too little, for either Poland, Turkey, or Persia, to rely again on her promises. During the last eight years these three powers, at three different periods, have been engaged in mortal strife with their giant neighbour, and though the struggle was well maintained in all three cases, each power had to fight the battle single handed. Experience like this has not been in vain. Turkey cannot forget, that when war with Russia was at its height, the British Parliament was too much engaged with its internal affairs to attend to any foreign interests. Persia has not forgotten that England stood idly looking on when the army of Yermaloff was actually pioneering the direct road to India. The Divan remembers well the forsaken state of the Porte, when her ambitious satrap dared to march with rebel colours into the very heart of her Asiatic dominions: they remember the British minister's answer to the Ottoman ambassador—an answer which must have sounded strangely from the first maritime power in Europe—viz. England was so occupied in blockading the Scheldt, and watching the Tagus, that she could not spare a single vessel for the coast of Syria. Such was the answer received from the very power which, a few years previous, had, either by a blunder of an officer, or his over-greedy thirst for fame, destroyed the unprepared fleet of an ancient and faithful ally. France was as great a loser as England; for while she shrunk from defending the Sultan in Asia, she made an almost direct attack upon his authority by her usurpations in Africa. Her influence with the Divan sensibly declined, nor are the instability of her own government, and subsequent foreign policy, likely to restore it. Disgusted by the inactivity of England, and unwilling to rely on France, the

Sultan was obliged to buy the friendship of Russia, and secure to his distracted kingdom the peace so necessary to it.

The readiness with which Mahomet Ali submitted to the remonstrances of England or France, proved the facility with which either of those two powers could have saved the Porte from the necessity of asking Russian aid. When before Acre, Ibrahim Pasha might have welcomed an excuse which would have allowed him to withdraw his forces; but as his subsequent march was a rapid succession of victories, it could scarcely be expected that he would immediately obey an order to halt. No sooner, however, was the displeasure of England and France known, than he paused in his glorious career, and there is little doubt that, until then, he had flattered himself that they secretly approved of his course. The terms on which the peace was finally concluded, were more advantageous to Mahomet Ali than creditable to the Sublime Porte. Syria, Adana, and Cyprus, were the rewards bestowed on successful rebellion, while the nominal allegiance of his vassal was all the Sultan received in return.

The blow is a severe one, which severs from the Ottoman Porte so large a portion of its dominions, but we are inclined to believe, that the provinces themselves will be benefitted by the separation. If Mahomet Ali is not forced by foreign intrigue, or tempted by his own ambition, to revolt against his sovereign, the country which languished under Turkish emissaries may rise into a powerful nation when concentrated under his immediate government. Whatever interested people may state to the contrary, Egypt has certainly prospered under his rule; and if the situation of the fellah is still subject to many hardships, it is nevertheless superior to his former state of military bondage. Mahomet Ali is perfect master of the country over which his vice-royalty extends, and whether a son of his succeeds, or a stranger is appointed to his vacant chair, the country will revert to the sovereign in a higher state of social organization than any other portion of his dominions.

Having briefly reviewed the history of the Porte, as well as its foreign relations, up to the last and most important war in which it has been engaged, we will now make a few observations on the present state and future prospects of the country. In doing so, we must dwell on the reigning monarch and his individual character as the most important feature in the picture, for on him and his firmness depend the success of the silent revolution which is now taking place in the opinions as well as government of the Turks. "He," to quote the writer in the Metropolitan, "has precipitated his kingdom into a state where it must either advance, or perish in a vain effort to retrace its steps. No longer able to entrench itself within the lines of obstinate barbarism, but brought

into immediate contact with European powers, Turkey must overtake its neighbours in the march of civilization, and prove its importance in the general council of nations." Fanaticism is no match for science, nor can the weapons of the seventeenth century be of any avail in the nineteenth. Mahmoud only anticipated an event which was inevitable, when he volunteered to impose upon his subjects a course, which they must, sooner or later, have adopted per force. Those who upbraid him with the bold steps he has already taken, know little of the previous state of Turkey, and understand that little very ill. A change was required by the actual position of affairs; had the Sultan been the greatest stickler in the world for antiquated usages, he must have sacrificed his prejudices, or have sacrificed himself. No power on earth can restore the fallen institutions of Turkey. Mahmoud, or Mahomet Ali—it matters not who holds the sceptre—both have favoured innovation, and the one, as well as the other, must force the new system into practice. This line of policy is no longer a subject of choice, it is one of absolute necessity. Instead of attempting to repair the gothic structure, which time, much more than the Sultan, has reduced to ruins, the architect must clear the ground and raise a new edifice in its stead. In such an important crisis, and with such a gigantic task to perform, it required daring like Mahmoud's to grasp the reins of government, and obstinacy like his, to hold them firm. Courage and perseverance, patience and diligence, were essential to the monarch, who, after wading through blood to a tottering throne, found that throne both undermined by domestic feuds, and beset with foreign enemies. A remorseless disposition, unhesitating firmness and singleness of view, are requisites in a successful renovator; and as far as the regal purple will allow us to discriminate his features, Mahmoud possesses, in a high degree, these characteristics. Sanguine or persevering, he boldly meets the greatest dangers, and stands in the most stirring times with unshaken nerve and unabated courage. When foreign war thundered at the gates of the capital, and domestic broil burst out beneath the wall of the seraglio, he held due on his course, and refused to abate one jot of his reforms. The enemy were at Tchorloo, and the foreign embassies exaggerated the danger; but Mahmoud, while he played the game with Russia to the last cast, crushed with an unflinching hand the conspiracy which had broken out in Constantinople. Had the Janissaries been in existence, they would have sacrificed Sultan after Sultan, and accompanied every reverse in the field, with a corresponding massacre in the capital; but Mahmoud's policy prevented similar occurrences, and gave him a command over his subjects, which no monarch had possessed

before him. He suppressed the sanguinary habits of the Turks, although at the expense of their martial prowess; and, tyrant or murderer as he is, made himself so essential to the welfare of his country, that it scarcely could exist without him.

Dreadful, indeed, has been the past history of Mahmoud, and while we admire the monarch, who could work his way through so many difficulties, we cannot refrain from shuddering at the man, who, day after day, signed the bloody firman of death. The annals of the seraglio contain a rapid succession of public massacres and private assassinations: poison, the bowstring, the executioner's axe, and the assassin's dagger, have been unsparingly employed; but not in one of the hundred cases where these means have been adopted, was personal malice the motive of the imperial mandate. Mahmoud does not correspond with the vulgar idea of an Eastern despot, for his actions are neither conceived by caprice, nor executed in the madness of passion, but are invariably prompted by cool calculation, and become the natural consequences of an undeviating line of policy. Those who recollect the period when he sealed the fate of the imbecile Mustapha, state, that he evinced strong sympathy with human feelings towards his dethroned brother, but, with an effort almost superhuman, he checked that sympathy the moment it crossed his personal ambition. With a perseverance almost unparalleled in history, he hunted down, even to the infant nephew, the family of Ali Pasha, nor could all the services of Halet Effendi arrest his master's hand when his death became an act of policy. Yet, Mahmoud, fratricide and destroyer as he is, never wars to crowd his harem with captive beauty, nor pilfers his subjects to surround his throne with luxury: his court is unostentatious, and his habits simple. One great but distant object is ever in his view: towards it he still leads on with an unwearied step, while, to attain it, he cares little in what paths he treads. To this firmness of purpose he adds an indifference to public opinion, and never allows his personal reputation to influence his official conduct. Renown, be it for good or evil—the pomp of a mighty monarch, or the fame of a national benefactor, are not the glittering, but unsubstantial rewards his vanity thirsts for: he neither seeks to win golden opinions from all sorts of people, nor to engrave for himself a fair name on the pages of history. Proud, but not vain, he toils in silence, and consents to imitate even the successful example of a subject. All the reforms introduced by Mahmoud, had been previously adopted by Mahomet Ali, and, if the innovations of the vassal succeeded better than those of the monarch, the cause must be traced to the circumstance of peace favouring the one, while war interrupted the other. The Arab character

is supposed to be more pliant than the Turkish, and the latter may be, in consequence, less susceptible of change, but the very cause which makes it difficult to stamp an impression, renders that impression more durable when made.—Constant to his object, but reckless of the means by which he attains it, Mahmoud does not disdain to profit by experience, or listen to advice. His mind is not shackled by prejudices, nor his judgment blinded by headstrong zeal; but, patient as well as active, he dares to think deliberately, and coolly acts upon conviction.—Such is the monarch who has begun the great work of reform, and on whom still depends the regeneration of Turkey.

In the early pages of this article, we traced the outline of the gigantic plan which Mahmoud laid down on ascending the throne, and now having hastily sketched the intervening history, we will state the present progress of the stupendous work.

In the first place, the military government established by the Janissaries in the capital no longer exists, but in its stead an effective and regular police has been organized. This police is not only sufficient to prevent disturbances, but, from the extremely peaceable character of the inhabitants, is seldom obliged to display its full force. While possessing a moral influence unknown to similar bodies in Europe, it neither intrudes into the privacy of domestic life, nor sets spies to overhear the conversations of men. Individual liberty is more respected in Turkey than in France, while the conspiracies and assassinations in the latter country quadruple those known in the former. Domiciliary visits, the absurd system of passports, and the arbitrary imprisonment of suspected persons, are acts of injustice alike unknown to the spirit and practice of Islam. The Seraskier, with his hundred and fifty *khavas*,<sup>a</sup> has maintained uninterrupted tranquillity during times of distress, entire weeks of festivity, and moments of political excitement.<sup>b</sup> The battle of Navarin, the flight of the ambassadors, the war with Russia, the treaty of Adrianople, the loss of Syria, and the landing of a Russian army in the Bosphorus, have all happened and passed away, without the capital being endangered by serious insurrection, or its inhabitants disturbed by riots. The Sultan lives in the public eye, and on the occasion of some great procession, the officer in command said—  
 “I came here to keep public order, but I find I have nothing to do but to admire it.”

Secondly, Mahmoud has successfully applied his reforming hand to the revenue, and introduced salutary regulations into its administration. The evil existed in the mode of collecting the *taxes*, rather than in the nature of the taxes themselves, for the only burdens the people had to bear, were a property-tax, assessed by mutual agreement between the government and the chiefs of each muni-

ciality, together with kharatch, or poll-tax, which is a substitute for service, and only levied on those who are exempt from bearing arms. Neither trade nor manufactures, conveyance of land, nor exchange of personal property, are shackled by duties, stamps, and the abstruse forms which impede the circulation of wealth in other states; but excrescences and abuses had crept in and encumbered a system which, in its original purity, did not oppress the people, while it amply supplied the treasury. By putting an end to the pernicious system of farming the taxes, Mahmoud has destroyed the chief source of oppression in the pashalics, while he has increased the amount of the revenue.

Thirdly. Mahmoud has waged incessant war on the lawless hordes who interrupted the peaceable habits of industry, and, by dint of perseverance, has cleared the country of the thieves who formerly infested it. The feudal chiefs have fallen, the people have been disarmed in the towns, and murders and robberies are now of more rare occurrence in Turkey than in most countries in Europe.

Fourthly. The difficulty of attending to all parts of this overgrown empire, has been diminished by the loss of some of the more distant provinces, and the principle of self-government adopted in others. The nominal sovereignty of the Sultan formerly extended from the frontiers of Morocco to the mountains of the Caucasus; but his actual power was confined almost within the walls of the seraglio. Since the last war, Russia has planted her standard at the mouth of the Danube, and is now trying her utmost to subdue the warlike population of Circassia; while, at the other extremity of the empire, France has appropriated Algiers, and threatens to extend her African conquests;—but within the remaining provinces of the Pofte, the Sultan's power is more influential, and the imperial mandate better obeyed, than during the proudest days of Ottoman rule. Prince Milosh in the north, and Mahomet Ali in the south, enjoy a higher authority than is generally accorded to delegated powers; but the distinct character of Servia, as well as Egypt, require a separate administration, as also great discretionary power in their governors. Under the immediate care of these active princes, their respective pashalics are advancing in order and civilization; while Ibrahim Pasha, in Syria, is effecting the very reforms which the Porte has adopted nearer home.

Fifthly. National and religious prejudices are daily disappearing, and the fanaticism which once distinguished the followers of Mahomet has given way to an enlightened spirit of toleration. The forms of all religions (save one) are adapted solely to the manners of the age in which they are made, and require to be modified or altered according to the progress of society. The

quent fasts and distant pilgrimages suited the wandering tribes in the barren deserts of Arabia, but accord ill with the luxurious Osmanlees who dwell in the midst of plenty on the richly cultivated banks of the Bosphorus. Aware of this, Mahmoud studiously neglects those observances which prevent the improvement of his subjects, and has fearlessly broken through the pale of antiquated usages. Religious fanaticism, if not kept alive by controversy, or roused to energy by persecution, sinks into a state of inaction, which, while it seems to be a healthy repose, is often the stealthy approach of death. Mahomedan zeal has slept so long that it is unwilling to be disturbed in its slumbers, and, like a man overcome with cold, it may indulge in the deceitful stupor till the vital spark itself becomes extinct. The Koran itself is an equitable though ill-arranged code of laws, and when weeded of a few absurd forms, and several false interpretations, can offer no serious impediment to the civilization of its followers. The law of inheritance is distinctly laid down, and a more just division of property has seldom been invented. Charity and almsgiving are so strongly inculcated by the Mahomedan religion, that the natural habits of the people supply the place of a defined poor law. The duties between parents and children, man and wife, master and servant, are distinctly traced, and generally well observed by the Turks. Neither in the spirit of the religion, nor in the natural disposition of the people, can any obstacle be found to the introduction of those graces and refinements which form the charm as well as tie of the best regulated societies.

Sixthly. Until the reign of Mahmoud began, powerful pashas were induced to revolt by the weakness displayed in bringing them to punishment; but since he has mounted the throne, pasha and bey have alike gone down before his persevering attacks. Mahomet Ali alone has escaped: in all other revolts, whether against Greeks or Albanians, the pasha of Scutari or the pasha of Bagdad, Mahmoud has been the same inflexible, uncompromising avenger. Severely was necessary to quell the almost universal spirit of insurrection which surrounded the Ottoman throne when the present Sultan ascended it; but now, since order is generally restored, we hope that the remainder of his reign will not require those violent measures which have marked its commencement.

Seventhly. Recent wars, and the active mind of the Sultan, have roused the Turks from the indolence, ease, and effeminacy, which they had adopted from the Greeks, in exchange for the hardier and more manly qualities of their ancestors. Curiosity, a thirst for knowledge, and the love of travel, are beginning to convince themselves in the youth of Turkey. The bath and pipe are no longer their only idea of a terrestrial paradise, but science, and

the graces of refined society, have already become objects of ambition among the higher classes of Osmanlees. The Sultan's spirit of enterprise has given a fresh impetus to the national mind; and, kept alive as it is by his exertions, there is no fear of a retrograde movement. New customs have already taken deep root in the soil, and all traces of discarded systems are fast disappearing. The young recruits are growing up into practised soldiers, and many of those who were sent to study in foreign lands have returned to instruct their own.

Eightily. Education, which was never entirely neglected in Turkey, is now generally attended to by government. A number of schools, both military and civil, have been recently opened, and one or two well-written newspapers appear weekly in the capital. The fine arts, as well as the useful sciences, have found a patron and promoter in the Sultan. Painting and music have been, for the first time, introduced amongst Mahomedans, and architecture, the most sublime as well as most useful of the arts, is now engaging his attention. A stranger on his first arrival in a foreign country, judges of a nation's grandeur by its public monuments, and the Turks suffer in the opinion of many on account of their poverty in this respect. The palaces of the Sultan are neither remarkable for their taste or solidity. The seraglio, like the kremlin, is rather a quarter of the city than a regal castle; while the other royal residences are, with a solitary exception, built of wood. The private houses, streets, bazaars, and quays, are poor both in material and ornament. The mosques alone lift their domes and minarets above the rest of the city, like the emblems of eternity amongst the fragile monuments of mortality. Plans of regular streets, and open squares, designs for palaces and government offices, as well as roads throughout the country, and bridges where only fords now exist, are already on paper, and likely soon to be put in execution.

With a people thus daily increasing their wants, and a government anxious to promote improvement, a commercial nation like England is bound to preserve a close and friendly alliance. Every reform of the Sultan opens a new mart for British manufactures. Articles of European invention, hitherto unused in Turkey, are daily coming into demand. The clothing of the army, the establishment of a press, the opening of the carriage-roads, and a new fashion in furniture, have given additional employment to English artizans, and brought to their masters a corresponding remuneration. But it is not merely on account of its own important trade, but on account of its being the high road to the rest of Asia, that the friendship of Turkey becomes necessary to England. The navigation of the Danube—the rising importance of Trebizond, together with the growing wants



of the Turkish population who inhabit the intervening shores—call upon us to watch with diligence the movements of the Russians in the Black Sea, and to resent, without hesitation, any insult offered to our flag. If England retreats one step, or bows in the least to her rival, she loses her entire interest in that quarter, and Russia obtains unbounded influence in the East. Whatever may be the natural inclination of the Turks, they can scarcely respect the nation which allows her own ships to be confiscated, her subjects imprisoned, her threats turned to laughter, and her ambassador denied the honour due to his situation. The Porte has favoured England—the Sultan has courted her friendship—but she will be neither favoured nor courted, if she do not reassert her dignity, and make her friendship worth preserving. There are only two European powers known in the East—Russia and England—and every advantage gained by the one, becomes, by necessity, a blow inflicted on the other. It is impossible to befriend both. Persia, as well as Turkey, must make her choice, and that choice can only be influenced by the conduct and importance of the respective candidates. The merits of the case are clearly understood at Constantinople, and so convinced are the Turks of their importance to England, that they attributed the backward conduct of the British Cabinet during the Russian war either to cowardice or impotence. They knew that that war was as injurious to British interests as disastrous to themselves; and they concluded, moreover, that if single-handed they did so much against their powerful enemy, they might have done anything when assisted by their western ally. But England laid her hand on her sword without daring to draw it; and Russia has, ever since that event, been considered the ascendant power of Europe. To propitiate the latter became then a matter of better policy than to cultivate the useless friendship of the former. Russia spares no means to convince the Divan of this important principle. She is ever reminding it of England's refusal to assist the Sultan, and her own readiness to check Mahomet Ali; without aiding the new system of Turkish organization, she acknowledges her full opinion of her ultimate success—flattering the monarch by the acknowledgment, and proving, at the same time, her intimate acquaintance with the resources of the country. Her policy does not sleep during the time of peace, but watches with attentive eyes every opportunity of courting the Mahomedan population, while England, by her galling neglect, betrays her general contempt for the nation.

Turkey is not, as some people would fain believe, crumbling to pieces; her power, on the contrary, is yearly becoming more **wieldy and consolidated**: her people are not sunk in barbarism, nor are her fertile fields uncultivated. Russia knows full well

the germs of wealth and power which exist in the Ottoman Empire; but in England a mist of ignorance had so completely clouded the subject, that Mr. Urquhart's book may be considered as the first ray of light which broke through the gloom. Since the publication of his pamphlet, the leading reviews, and the Ottoman Moniteur, have displayed great abilities in elucidating the truth, while ancient prejudices against the Turks are considerably shaken by the gentlemanly conduct of many Osmanlees who have visited this country. It is from sources like these that we must seek information, because the English Embassy and the Court of the Seraglio are as effectually kept asunder by a crowd of dragomen and interpreters, as the British hotel is separated from the palace of the Sublime Porte by the intervening waters of the Golden Horn. Our ignorance of the language, and a reluctance to conform to Eastern manners, have hitherto prevented any mutual communication of ideas between the two nations; but the residence of a Turkish Embassy amongst us, and the recent appointment of Mr. Urquhart are calculated to bring them into amicable contact.

Before concluding this article, we will briefly refer to the seizure of the *Vixen*, and the Foreign Secretary's speech on the subject. By the treaty of Bucharest, Russia engaged to evacuate the fortresses on the Circassian coast, and fixed on the Kuban as her southern frontier. She did not fulfil her engagement, but her obligation to do so was never doubted by Europe. The independence of Circassia was not compromised by the question, as the Porte had a right to insist that no territorial acquisitions should be made by Russia, even although not made at the expense of Turkey. The negotiations of Ackerman, proposed to adopt the actual state of the Caucasus as the line of the Russian frontier; but those negotiations were based on the supposition, that all previous treaties should be strictly executed. The treaty of Bucharest remained unrepealed when the treaty of London was signed; and France and England must have bound Russia to forego all augmentation of territory, on the understanding that her frontier was sufficiently defined by the treaty of Bucharest. The treaty of London was prior to the treaty of Adrianople; and as neither France nor England were parties to the latter, they must consider the former as the basis of their negotiations with Russia. If we are rightly informed, the Duke of Wellington protested, in the name of England, against the further cession of territory on the part of Turkey; but, without listening to the protest, Russia forced from Achmet Pasha the separate treaty of St. Petersburg. This last treaty was signed on the 29th of January, 1834, and was accompanied by a map, on which the frontiers of the two countries were defined by a red

line. The line commenced at the Port St. Nicolo, passed along the frontier of the provinces of Gurjel and Jaira, traversed Akhiskha, and struck the point where Akhiskha and Cars unite to Georgia. Here there is a positive increase of territory, notwithstanding the promises contained to the contrary, both in the treaty of London and the declaration of war. The question, therefore, resolves itself into this—Will England and France allow Russia to break her most solemn engagements to them, and set at defiance their power to coerce her?

The case was very plainly stated both by Lord Dudley Stuart and Mr. O'Connell, in the House of Commons, but the reply of the Noble Secretary for Foreign Affairs was scarcely becoming the dignity of a British minister. It must be that the noble lord lacks gall to make oppression bitter, or he would have surely spoken in more indignant terms of Russian aggression, and the insult offered to the English flag. He asks for time to investigate the question, and means to negotiate with St. Petersburg: but what investigation or negotiation is necessary? Russia has either broken, in the face of Europe, her solemn treaties with England, or seized an English vessel on the coast of an independent state, without deigning to inform us that she had gone to war. In either case, the insult is apparent, and what need can there therefore be, of farther negotiation or investigation? The backwardness of England in this proceeding, is placed in bolder relief by the contrast it forms with the extravagant reparation demanded for a recent insult offered to a British subject in another country. There the noble lord had to deal with a comparatively weaker power, and there he feared not to assume an imperious tone; but now that an outrage is committed on British subjects, a hundred-fold more enormous than that inflicted on Mr. Churchill, the Foreign Secretary withdraws from the responsibility, and looks out for a loophole to escape from the scrape.

The obstacles put in the way of British trade, by Russia, at the mouth of the Danube, deserve the attention of Lord Palmerston as well as the seizure of the Vixen. Under the plea of quarantine regulations, forts have been erected and vessels detained, although the one is contrary to the special treaties with Turkey, and the other a direct attack on the flag of friendly powers. Until trade is protected, and the Black Sea rescued from the arbitrary rule of Russia, it is useless to enter into commercial negotiations with Turkey, or expect great advantages from an alteration in her tariff.

*Note.*—We find the names of places spelt differently in different maps. The largest, if not the most correct, map of the Caucasus, was drawn by order of the Russian government in the year 1826.

ART. XII.—1. *Xeniola—Poems and Translations from Schiller and De la Motte Fouqué.* By John Anster, LL.D. Dublin. 1837.

2. *Corn Law Rhymes and Poems.* By Ebenezer Elliott. 3 vols. Benjamin Steill. London. 1834,35.

**D**R. ANSTER'S reputation as a poet, is well established by his version of the *Faust*, and although the translations contained in his present little volume are but fragments, yet they are fully equal to his fame, and we hope that he may be mistaken in believing, "that the occupations of active life leave him little chance in future of leisure for such studies,\*" (Preface.) The principal translation consists of scenes from "*A Drama, by De la Motte Fouqué.*" The scenes are detached, and the story of the drama, (which is an extravagant one,) is chiefly made out by the notes. This method of selecting the choice morsels of a poem is very tantalizing, and one which we should be sorry to see often pursued by an author, in whose hands translations cease to be what they so frequently are—mere gratifications to the curiosity of the idle or unlearned; and become a valuable acquisition to our literature, taking the same rank in our language as in the originals. But in a work of this unpretending description, we must not criticize the author's plan, but shall content ourselves with extracting some of the beautiful passages which Dr. Anster has thus strung together:—

FLORUS.—

"Forth wandering with thee, rich light of the morning,  
That now, in glory, o'er the wood of firs,  
Dost rise, and brighten into living gold  
The vaporous clouds, I tread again this loved  
And lonely valley—Sweet, secluded haunt,  
Which none intrudes on!—My sick father still  
Is slumbering;—fearful dreams stand round his bed,  
Disquieting his rest, and torturing me,  
Each night the witness of his agonies:—  
But every creature has its load to bear,  
And every creature has its source of comfort.  
The bee, who revels here 'mong perfumed flowers,  
Voluptuously will soon, fatigued, return,  
A burthened labourer, to her fragrant cell.

---

\* Since this article was written, we have had the pleasure to hear, that Earl Mulgrave has done himself honour, and given satisfaction to ALL PARTIES, by the promotion of the author to a lucrative and honourable office in one of the Irish law courts.

Why, *Florus*, why complain then of thy task?  
 Thou hast, like them, thy spring of consolation—  
 Enjoyments, that refresh thy languid spirit  
 In the blest hours of silent dewy morn.”—p. 121.

The old father, a prey to remorse, beholds his youthful and innocent son, and his feelings are expressed with much nature and tenderness:—

“ Oh ! how this beautiful and blooming face,  
 Reflecting every motion of the spirit,  
 Reminds me of the days that have gone by !—  
 I too was gay, and innocent as he :  
 I too had nothing to conceal. It seems  
 When I behold him, as if I myself  
 Came, in the brightness of my better days,  
 Here to reproach the gray old man with crimes  
 Done in the melancholy interval.”—p. 139.

The father being unable to undertake a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, which he considers necessary for the expiation of the crime of murder, of which he believes himself to be guilty, after some difficulty, prevails on his sons to perform it for him. The two young men set out separately, and accidentally meet a magician in the gardens of *Hormisdas*. The poet introduces a scene in the garden between the youths and some maidens, attendants on the magician. The passage, without any very striking lines, has a dreamy beauty, well suited to a “valley in *Arabia Felix*,” and to the character of the personages. We transcribe it almost entirely:—

#### A YOUTH.

“ O'er the happy plains for ever  
 Comes the breath of amber fragrance,—  
 A sea of sweets, that soothes the spirit,  
 Restores the powers, that earth has wasted,—  
 Diffuses bliss unutterable ;  
 But from what rich flowers delicious,  
 From what tree, whose tears are perfume,  
 Flows the aromatic current ?  
 Who can tell its secret fountain ?  
 I can tell it ;—I have found it,—  
 And I fill my magic phial  
 With the prize invaluable :  
*Hormisdas* bends, and gazes in the glass—  
 Unseen the gales of fragrance rise  
 Impatiently, to breathe  
 Round *Zilia's* hair, round *Zilia's* graceful form !

#### A MAIDEN.

Oh, what a happy lot is mine !  
 My occupation all is cheerful play,

And after occupation, sweet repose—  
 Reward of happy toils !  
 How happy am I here, removed from all,  
 That once I loved, an ignorant poor child !  
 —The gloomy wood, and the moss-covered cottage !  
 The tale my mother told,  
 —Poor woman, only rich in fairy tales,—  
 Has been to me most splendidly accomplished :  
 On her bosom I was sleeping,—  
 When came at eve a wondrous dream,  
 That half unclosed my eyes,  
 And gave me strength to run ;—  
 It led me far away.  
 Long did my mother sleep,  
 And wept, when she awoke,  
 To find her child was gone !  
 And I beheld her tears !  
 —But the dream Hormisdas sent  
 Lured me to this pleasant place,  
 To one eternal round of joy ;  
 Far away my native cottage  
 Lies, forgotten, unregretted,  
 In the gloom of poverty !  
 And I play with pearls and diamonds,  
 Happy, happy girl that I am !

## A YOUTH.

From the lofty war-proof fortress  
 Where, cresting the high hill, in splendour  
 Shine the walls and battlements,  
 Over a wide range of prospect,  
 I ran, a happy child, delighted  
 To wander in the pleasant greenwood ;  
 To enjoy the huntsman's pleasures,  
 As I oft had seen my father  
 Hunting with his boon companions !—  
 But how sweet, how heart-refreshing,  
 Were the scenes that in the forest  
 Soothed my captivated senses !  
 All that wide and shadowy meadow,  
 All that roof of meeting branches,  
 Vocal with mysterious music,  
 That flowed forth, as from a fountain,  
 From the breathing lips of HYMNUS,  
 Who there was standing visibly ;  
 He held me with his giant arm,  
 He flattered me with words seducing,  
 From those sweet lips, red as roses ;  
 —I was his—a willing captive !  
 He bore me from my native meadows,

Up into the blue sky starry,  
 Holy night's serene dominions,  
 Gliding fast, with unfelt motion,  
 Down sank I, 'mong flowers and fragrance,  
 Sank down,—and in the garden of Hormisdas !  
 And willingly dō I resign the chace,  
 And all its pleasures ; lingering happy here,  
 Singing my idle songs 'mong fragrant flowers !

## A MAIDEN.

I was playing in the garden,  
 On our roof in Ascalon !  
 When a butterfly came humming  
 O'er the flowers, and I was tempted  
 To follow the bright flutterer,  
 And the slender sounds were woven  
 To a web of gold, that, rustling,  
 Lifted me with impulse airy !  
 And they then were changed to winglets  
 That grew upon my shoulders graceful.  
 Hither I move to these delightful gardens,  
 Happy in heart ; and think of Ascalon  
 With scorn—the city that the stranger seeks ;  
 The ornament and glory of the east !

## A YOUTH.

I know the land of the evening sun—  
 Of the giant oak—of the cloud and storm—  
 Whose lakes are roofed with ice.  
 Where the morning rises chill,  
 And the night, from dreary wing,  
 Showers hoar frost on the shrinking flowers ;  
 And warriors, clad in arms, are there  
 Loud sounding, splendid, heavy arms of steel ;  
 Swords in their hands, unlike the scimeter ;  
 The blade unbent, and double edged, cuts straight  
 Into the faces of the enemy ;  
 From the heavy-visored helm  
 A cloud of many-coloured plumes  
 Streams in the playful breeze.  
 And my friends wished that I should be a soldier.  
 Already had I learned to bend  
 The war horse to my will ;  
 Already, with an active arm,  
 Could sway the warrior's sword ;  
 But, as I rested after my first battle,  
 There came, with friendly words, a gray old man.  
 He sate beside me. From his lips streamed forth  
 A wondrous tale. Unceasingly it streamed ;  
 Holding enchanted my surrendered soul,  
 Till the sweet stars came gemming the blue sky.

And then he rose, but still the tale continued ;  
 And on we wandered, and the narrative  
 Was still unfinished, and we reached the shore ;  
 I following him, unable to resist  
 The magic of his voice !  
 Rapidly, rapidly he went ;  
 Rapidly, rapidly I followed him :  
 I threw away the shield that burthened me,  
 I threw away from me the encumbering sword,  
 And we embarked, and still the tale continued,  
 All day ! all night ! The moon did wax and wane,  
 I cannot tell how many times, while he  
 Was busy with his story ; while my soul  
 Lived on its magic ; and I felt no want  
 Of food or drink or sleep. At last we came  
 Here to Horniscias, the magician's garden :  
 And when we reached this silver rivulet,  
 The tale was ended—the old man was vanished.  
 And now for iron arms I wear  
 The soft silk, light and delicate,  
 And feel no wounds but those of Love !”—pp. 157-163.

We shall now turn to Dr. Anster's original poetry, which we have read with great pleasure. Some however of the smaller poems, take for instance the "Everlasting Rose," are too laboured and heavy; the lightness, the grace, the point, which render poetical trifles agreeable, are not we think the characteristics of Dr. Anster's style. There are also some exaggerated sentiments which surprise and displease us in poetry that is in general—what true poetry should always be—studied and highly finished, as in the following :

" Hast thou beheld the obedient march of waves,  
 The appointed flow, the regulated fall,  
 The rise, and lapse alternate ? even as soon  
 Shall they rebel against the silent maid,  
 Who walks in joy among the company  
 Of stars, and smiles enchantment on the deep,  
 As poets struggle with the awful Power  
 That wakes the slumbering spirit into song."—p. 79.

With all submission, we think these two lines absolute bathos after so solemn an exordium; which might, indeed, have been in one sense applicable to the next lines.

" As man forbid the soul to undulate  
 Through all its depths, what time the breath of heaven  
 Moves o'er the darkness."

But, as the two passages do not certainly express the same thing, one or other of them is, we think, improperly introduced.



Again in his Ode to Fancy—

"Fancy with thee I love to stray,  
With thee would seek the dungeon's gloom,  
Renounce for aye the visions gay  
That pleasure's tints illumine;

\* \* \* \*

Would where the Alpine hunter fears to breathe  
Lie down the tremulous avalanche beneath,  
If thy rich visions swam before mine eye!  
Would launch the light skiff, where the wild waves sweep  
Down Niagara's dizzy steep,  
If thy angelic form were nigh!"—p. 64.

We must say we rather doubt this; and regret the absence of that sobriety, or, in other words, that *truth* of feeling which should be the groundwork of the most vivid fancies. The death of the Princess Charlotte was an exciting subject for a young poet; and the Dublin University a place in which moderation of all sorts must be sadly out of countenance; we cannot, therefore, be surprised to find in his prize poem such a sentiment as the following:—

"Famine hath thin'd the land! in autumn's gale  
We felt his icy breath;—Plague rushes by,  
Or, resting in clear air, on silent wing,  
Numbers his victims, who behold him not.

\* \* \* \*

Weep!—a severer judgment!—bend to earth  
The stubborn knee, and ere the lightnings strike,  
Oh, call on heaven in agony of prayer!  
Weep!—a severer judgment!—Oh, what woes  
Are destined for the earth! what heavier clouds  
Of wrath are deepening round us—*SHE* hath died!"—p. 48.

These, however, are only exceptions to the general style of Dr. Anster's poetry, which is correct and noble; his descriptions are extremely beautiful, and yet are kept in a proper subservience to a strain of poetical and lofty meditation. We must give an example of this from the poem on Solitude:—

"At Spring's return the earth is glad,  
And yet to me at this lone hour  
The wood-dove's note from yonder natural bower,  
Though winning sweet, is sad;—  
Calmly the cool wind heaves  
The elm's broad boughs, whose shadows seem  
Like some deep vault below the stream:  
The melancholy beech still grieves,  
As in the scattering gale are shed  
Her red and wrinkled leaves;—  
And from the yew by yon forgotten grave,  
Hark! the lone robin mourning o'er the dead.

Spirit, by whom man's spirit is subdued,  
 Thou, that, 'mid awful nature's quietude  
 Dost on the green earth breathe a tenderer hue;  
 On the reposing skies a darker blue;  
     Spirit, whate'er thy name,  
     No other hymn than thine  
 Shall tremble from the Clarshec's\* frame,  
     Whose strings, neglected long,  
     Again shall echo to the song;  
 Shall hail the inspiring nymph whose holy power  
 Bids wisdom and delight to bless the lonely hour.  
 — Sec where most mild, most sad,  
     The goddess on her mountain throne  
 Of rocks, with many-coloured lichens clad,  
 Is soothed by gurgling waters near,  
 Or song of sky-lark wild and clear,  
     Or music's mellow tone:  
 The scarce heard hum of distant strife  
     Breaks not the consecrated rest,  
     The Sabbath quiet of that breast,  
 Unruffled by the woes, above the mirth of life.  
     Awful thoughts for ever roll,  
     Shadowing the silent soul,  
     Like the twilight, tall rocks throw  
     Far into the vale below;—  
 Here Genius, in fantastic trance,  
     Enjoys his wildest reverie,  
     Or pores with serious eye  
 Upon some old romance,  
     Till all the pomp of chivalry,  
     The vizor quaint of armed knight,  
     And stately dance and tourney bright,  
 Are present to his glance.  
 And Fancy here delights to stray,  
     And shed around her smiles serene;  
 Not those alone that for the poet play,—  
     Too grandly, too divinely bright,  
     They pain with luxury of light!—  
 Here she exerts a gentle sway,  
     And gives to Happiness the tranquil scene;  
 She breathes with soft control  
     An holy sense of sobered joy,  
     And sorrows that no more annoy,  
 Are pleasant to the soul;—  
 The breast that throbb'd before too much  
 At sorrow's wound, at pleasure's touch,  
 Indulging here in calm repose,  
 No change of shifting passions knows.  
 Thus, when the winds, with wanton play,  
 Among the aspin's branches stray,

---

\* The Irish Harp.

The twinkling leaves are seen,  
 Give to the light their lively gray;  
 But when the breezes die away,  
 They smile in softest green :—  
 Oft, in that quiet silence of the breast,  
 When passions pause, and all is peace within,  
 Feelings awake, and thoughts that will not rest,  
 Of heaven and man,—of holiness and sin ;—  
 Like thunders, o'er the evening vale that roll,  
 There comes a voice of more than mortal birth,  
 Its accents are not of the earth—  
 "Tis God that speaketh to the soul!"—p. 69.

The following passage from the "Triumph of Music," though in a different style, is not less beautiful; and with it we must conclude our extracts, from a little work which has afforded us much pleasure. Dr. Anster's talent for poetry is too manifest, and his love for it too sincere, to give way easily to other avocations; and we trust, therefore, that it will not be long ere we meet with him again, and that in a form more fitted to give scope to his genius, than the fragments before us.

"To the battle—to the battle—Hurry out—  
 To the tumult—and the shriek and the shout.  
 Hark! the bugle, how it thrills—'To the strife!'  
 'What is life?'—and the trumpet—'What is life?'"  
 In every tone is Victory—how they scatter into air  
 Before the sunny music, clouds of doubt, and fear, and care.  
 Already is the triumph won!—already Fancy weaves,  
 Dyed in the blood of enemies, the wreath of laurel leaves!  
 Wild in the war-whoop what ominous voices  
 We hear o'er the battle-field pealing aloft—  
 Peace smiles: in her sweet smile the green earth rejoices,  
 And welcoming Music comes mellow and soft.  
 Slow down cathedral aisles streams prayer and praise,  
 As home returning from the battle-field,  
 Their hands and hearts the joyous victors raise  
 To Him, who in the battle was their shield.  
 Listen to the death-bell tolling,  
 And its accents of consoling,  
 Telling to the long oppressed,  
 That the weary is at rest,  
 To the mourner whispering  
 Of an everlasting spring;  
 Soothing thus, and reconciling,  
 Softening, and to tears beguiling,  
 With their measured murmurs deep,  
 Agony that could not weep!  
 Mysterious tones!—and is it that you are  
 The dreamy voices of a world unknown;

Heard faintly from the Paradise afar,  
 Our Father's home, and yet to be our own !  
 Breathe on ! breathe on, sweet tones !—still sing to me,  
 Still sing to me of that angelic shore,  
 That I may dream myself in heaven to be,  
 And fancy life and all its sorrows o'er !"—p. 108.

Perhaps some explanation may be looked for of our notice of Mr. Elliott's poems so long after their publication. To Mr. Elliott, who, we are aware, is somewhat sensitive on the score of neglect on the part of a *quarterly* publication, we shall say only, that as we have come but recently into the field in that character, we are desirous that in his next edition our names should figure in his bead-roll of periodical literature. To the public we shall merely say, that we are not aware of any very modern poet more worthy of notice than Mr. Elliott, the more especially as his glaring defects are very closely connected with our national, moral, social, and political deficiencies. That Mr. Elliott is possessed of talents and genius of a high order, we think no one will deny ; but when we behold the melancholy neutralization of such talents by a remarkable obliquity of moral vision, we are compelled to impute the blame to the proper quarter—the fundamental defects in the social and political position of the great bulk of the community. Mr. Elliott describes himself as "hardly raised above the lowest class," (vol. i. p. 51) and who can doubt that if in youth his talents had been cultivated, in the bosom of sound and liberal social and political institutions, the inspirations of his genius in maturity would have been as instructive as they are remarkable ? As it is, however, we fear our readers will agree with us in thinking, that as regards the real use of Literature, Mr. Elliott's genius had better have remained unknown ;—better to have perished in obscurity than to have arrived at the very verge of being a scourge to his fellow-countrymen. For we are bound to state, that such, in our judgment, would be the result of carrying the social and political opinions of our author into actual operation. But, thanks to the progress of reform in the institutions of the nation, we are enabled to hope that such phenomena as we are contemplating will no longer be a blot upon our country ; and that the proper cultivation of the plants of liberty and education, will be productive of the fruits of happiness and contentment in all classes of the community.

Mr. Elliott, in the Preface to one of his shorter poems, (vol. i. p. 51) makes this interrogation : "Is it strange that my language is fervent as a welding heat, when my thoughts are *passions*, that rush burning from my mind like white-hot bolts of steel ?" Had he said *passion* instead of *passions*, we could have accepted this

as a definition of his writings—of their beauties and of their defects. Our author is a political economist of the discontented class—an opposer of the present order of things; and the centre, the pivot, the “one idea,” of his system of opposition, is the Corn Laws, or, in the author’s phrase, “the bread-tax;” and to this one idea his mind clings with a fierceness and a tenacity approaching to monomania. We disclaim all intention of considering the correctness of the author’s views upon this point; the discussion would be too ponderous for the present occasion; and moreover, whoever has read, or shall be induced to read, the work, will have had, we think, without our assistance, quite enough of the subject, which forms, in every sense, the burden of the three volumes, and is introduced in every tone, from the wildest and (we must say) the most abusive fury, to that of a melancholy and monotonous maundering. But to us, who are enthusiastic lovers of the muses, poetry for itself, and on its own account, will always be a topic of great interest, whatever be the subject it may treat of, and about which we would not be fastidious; for we agree with Mr. Elliott, “that any subject on which man takes interest, however humble and common-place it may be, is capable of inspiring high and true poetry.” (vol. i. p. 48.) This interest is independent in a great measure even of the sentiments which the poetry may convey; for who has not turned with pain and a feeling of reverential shame, from some of the sentiments contained in the most admired works?

Apart from these considerations is the interest which we take in a new poem,—the eagerness with which we examine the claims of any new pretender to that most enchanting, most undefinable gift—the power of feeling and expressing poetry. Undefinable we may well call it; for how often have those who loved it most been puzzled when called upon to explain what was the sunbeam that lighted into loveliness some trite and homely picture, or wherein lay the deficiency, when correct and graceful lines have fallen heavy and powerless upon the mind! How often have we been at a loss to point out the art which, in some instances, will make melody an all-sufficient spell upon the senses, while so many flowing lines are rejected with little ceremony as “sing-song,” and in others the perversity of our ear has delighted in some bold and rugged verse that seemingly set melody at defiance! Who, indeed, can explain that subtle power of genius—that combination of the finest qualities—that fragrant essence of man’s mind, which, infusing itself into all things that surround or cross his path, can brighten and refine them into beauty! Yet without something of this spirit, we cannot consent that any one shall claim to himself the name of poet,—we cannot accept

any substitute for it, whether in the pleasing domestic descriptions which it goes to one's heart to criticise, or in the impetuosity of a warped and self-concentrated mind. And such we consider Mr. Elliott's to be. He has great command of language (though he frequently shows very bad taste in the selection of it), and he occasionally rises into flights of considerable grandeur and impressiveness; more especially when drawing from that purest and most soothing of all (earthly) sources of inspiration,—a joy in the harmonious beauty spread out before us on the face of nature. But even these fine passages are too often marred by the harsh sameness of thought which renders the poems (taken as a whole) decidedly unpleasing. Our author cannot apostrophize a singing thrush, but he must conclude with such a line as—

“Then for *thy* sake I will not loathe man's face.”—vol. iii. p. 89.

And he interrupts some powerful lines on “Win Hill,” by working himself up to an equally sublime philanthropy on the subject of a human skeleton found on the summit of the hill:—

“And I will *not* loathe man, although he be  
Adder and tiger! for his sake who died  
Here, in his desolation, great and free.”—vol. iii. p. 67.

Ah! but then—“Was this unfortunate a victim of the corn laws?” exclaims our author in a note (*ib.*); and forthwith, kindling at the thought, he continues,—“*Then*, for the honour of our common nature, the system of free exchange and unrestricted industry ought to be fairly and fully tried. If it fail to rescue man from pauperism, and his name from disgrace which would enrage a viper and make the earth-worm blush, let us, like the failing eagle, retire indignantly to woods and deserts, and perish there.” We must not, however, be drawn into farther quotation of Mr. Elliott's marvellous notes. But our author is not always so fierce: his admiration of the inanimate creation sometimes rises to a height to which few people, not imbued with the wildest fancy, can ever expect to soar. Take, for instance, the following address to the primrose:—

“Still, as of old, Day glows with love for thee,  
And reads our heavenly father in thy face.  
Surely thy thoughts are humble and devout,  
Flower of the pensive gold! for why should Heaven  
Deny to thee his noblest boon of thought,  
If to earth's demi-gods 'tis vainly given?”—vol. ii. p. 283.

We will now proceed to give some specimens of Mr. Elliott's best style of description:—

"Hail, silence of the desert! I speak low  
 In reverence.—Here the falcon's wing is awed,  
 As o'er the deep repose, sublimely slow,  
 He wheels in conscious majesty abroad.  
 Spirits should make the deserts their abode.  
 The meekest, purest, mightiest that e'er wore  
 Dust as a garment, stole from crowds unblest'd  
 To sea-like forests, or the sea-beat shore,  
 And uttered on the star-sought mountain's breast  
 The holiest precepts e'er to dust address'd."—vol. ii. p. 70.

The following description of evening is very graphic:—

"The storm hath ceas'd; the sun is set; the trees  
 Are fain to slumber; and, on Ocean's breast,  
 How softly, yet how solemnly, the breeze  
 With unperceiv'd gradation, sinks to rest!  
 No voice, no sound, is on the ear impress'd.  
 Twilight is weeping o'er the pensive rose;  
 The stoat slumbers, coil'd up in his nest;  
 The grosbeak on the owl's perch seeks repose;  
 And o'er the heights, behold a pale light glows.  
 Wak'd by the bat, up springs the startled snake;  
 The cloud's edge brightens,—lo the moon and grove  
 And tree and shrub, bathed in her beams, awake,  
 With tresses cluster'd like the locks of love.  
 Behold! the ocean's tremor; slowly move  
 The cloud-like sails; and as their way they urge,  
 Fancy might almost deem she saw, above,  
 The streamer's chastened hues: bright sleeps the surge,  
 And dark the rocks, on ocean's glittering verge.  
 Now lovers meet, and labour's task is done.  
 Now stillness hears the breathing heifer. Now  
 Heav'n's azure deepens; and where rock-rills run  
 Rest on the shaggy mountain's airy brow  
 Clouds that have ta'en their farewell of the sun,  
 While calmness, reigning o'er that wintry clime,  
 Pauses and listens—hark! the evening gun!  
 Oh, hark—the sound expires, and silence is sublime."  
 (Vol. i. p. 193.)

A fit companion to this picture is the following description of sun-rise, with which we shall conclude this portion of our extracts:—

"Morn soon will smile on nature's drooping charms,  
 And smoothe the tresses which the night has riven;  
 But no sun shall arise that wretch to cheer;  
 Alas! his grief despairs, and hath no tear!  
 From heaven's deep blue, the stars steal, one by one;  
 Pale fades the moon—still paler—she is gone.

As yet no marshalled clouds in splendour rolled,  
 See, on Patowmac's breast, their mirror'd gold;  
 Yet, eastward, lo! th' horizon forest fringed,  
 Blushes—and dusky heights are ruby tinged!  
 Lo! like a warrior in impatient ire,  
 On mailed steed, fire-scarfed and helm'd with fire,  
 Forth rides the sun, in burning beauty strong,  
 Hurling his bright shafts—as he darts along!  
 Oh! not more splendidly emerged the morn,  
 When light, and life, and blissful love were born,  
 And day and beauty, ere his woes began,  
 Smiled first Elysium on the soul of man;  
 And—while no cloud in stillest heaven was seen—  
 O'er ocean's waveless magnitude serene,  
 Rose all on flame his vital race to run,  
 In dreadless youth, how proudly rose that sun!"—

Vol. i. p. 184.

These are beautiful passages, and free from the constant introduction of compound epithets, which is a great blemish in Mr. Elliott's verses. "Souls guilt-clotted," "woe-marked hill," "storm-swollen torrent," "sun-loved wave," "king-humbling blind misrule," "the man wheel-shattered," "time-dark heights," "bone-weary," "many-childed," "trouble-tried," "sky-tinged hills," "storm-bird," "bread-tax-dy'd," "million-feeding enginery," "Satrap-imitating state," "shoulder-shaking grasp," "stream-loved England," &c.

These, however, are minor defects, and might easily be avoided by an author who has so great a command of language as Mr. Elliott.

But what can be said of the spirit which animates the following lines?—

"Canst thou behold this land, oh, Holy light!  
 And not turn black with horror at the sight?  
 Fallen country of my fathers! fall'n and foul!  
 Thy body still is here—but where the soul?  
 I look upon a corpse—'tis putrid clay—  
 And fiends possess it. Vampires, quit your prey!  
 Or vainly tremble, when the dead arise  
 Clarioned to vengeance by shriek-shaken skies,  
 And cranch your hearts, and drink your blood for ale—  
 Then, eat each other, till the banquet fail."—(Vol. i. p. 43.)

The want of self-government, through which our author thus tears his passion to rags, and the depraved taste which scruples, no image, however loathsome, which may be pressed into its service, are still more strongly exemplified in our next extract:—



"Hurrah, for the land where the scab of to-day  
 Claims kindred with ulcers a hundred years old ;  
 And new pus turns pale, lest the knife cut away  
 Some ancient of fetor, (?) gore-clotted with gold,  
 And lively, and lousy, with venom, that makes  
 The grubs which it drops upon turns into snakes."

(Vol. iii. p. 110.)

But we must relieve our readers from all these horrors by a stroke of pathos—an apostrophe to a plum-pudding ! which must, we think, grieve the hearts and astonish the minds of all sincere lovers of that dainty.

"Yet poor man's pudding ! rich with spicy crumbs,  
 And tiers of currants thick as both my thumbs—  
 Where art thou, festal pudding of our sires ?  
 Gone, to feed fat the heirs of thieves and liars ;—  
 Gone, to oppress the wronged, the true, the brave,  
 And wide and deep, dig Poland's second grave."

(Vol. i. p. 33.)

We shall make no remarks on our concluding extracts taken almost at random. They must, we think, speak for themselves, and illustrate more strongly than we could do our author's views, and his mode of expressing them.

"Ye coop us up, and tax our bread,  
 And wonder why we pine ;  
 But ye are fat, and round, and red,  
 And filled with tax-bought wine.  
 Thus, twelve rats starve while three rats thrive,  
 (Like you on mine and me),  
 When fifteen rats are caged alive,  
 With food for nine and three.

Make haste, slow rogues ! *prohibit* trade,  
*Prohibit* honest gain ;  
 Turn all the good that God has made,  
 To fear, and hate, and pain ;  
 Till beggars all, assassins all,  
 All cannibals we be,  
 And death shall have no funeral  
 From shipless sea to sea."—vol. i. p. 77.

"Forget not yet land-butchered Peterloo !  
 Are ye not bread-taxed ? What they did they do,  
 And then most treacherous when they holiest seem,  
 At your salvation here take deadliest aim.  
 Oh ! trust them not ! but henceforth rightly deem  
 Of sordid fiends, who murder hope and shame,  
 And for a bread-tax, wrapped the world in flame,

Nor marvel, if athwart the exulting seas,  
 A steam-highway bring soon to their firesides  
 War, and its long inflicted miseries,  
 To plough them with the plough which havoc guides,  
 Despite their wide-winged sway o'er winds and tides.  
 Meantime, like wolves full gorged, they lick their jaws,  
 And, sick of prey, roll wide their eyes for more :  
 But from their black and crime-distended maws  
 Eject not yet the clotted gold and gore,  
 The price of souls, death-freed on many a shore."— vol. i. p. 153.

To the two following quotations Mr. Elliott has not blushed to give the name of Corn-Law *Hymns* :—

" The locustry of Britain  
     Are gods beneath the skies ;  
 They stamp the brave into the grave ;  
     They feed on famine's sighs ;  
 They blight all homes, they break all hearts,  
     Except, alas, their own !  
         While a moan, and a groan,  
 That move th' Almighty's throne,  
 Bring angels tears in pity down,  
     And move th' eternal throne !

" The bread-tax of England,  
     What awful powers they are !  
 They make a league with want and crime !  
     On plenty they wage war !  
 They curse the land, the winds, the seas ;  
     Lord ! have they conquer'd thee ?  
         With a frown, looking down,  
 While they curse the land and sea,  
 They rival hell, and libel heaven,  
     But have not vanquished thee."—vol. iii. p. 187.

" If he who kills the body  
     A murderer's death shall die ;  
 If he who slays the human soul  
     Would hail God from on high ;  
 Then, they who make our hopes, our lives,  
     Our children's souls their prey,  
         Unforgiven, loathed of heaven,  
     In life and death are they ;  
 Who kill the body and the soul,  
     But first the spirit slay !

" Behold the flag of England,  
     In tyrants' battles rent !  
 We fought for Britain's locustry,  
     And self o'ercome, lament.



Whom feeds Arthur Bread-tax-winner ?

All our rivals, sire and son,  
Foreign cutler, foreign spinner,  
Bless their patron, Famine-ton.

Prussia fattens—we get thinner !  
Bread-tax barterers all for none :  
Bravo ! Arthur Bread-tax-winner !  
Shallow, half-brained Famine-ton !

Empty thinks the devil's in her :  
Take will grin, when Make is gone !  
Bread-tax teaches saint and sinner,  
Grinning, flint-faced Famine-ton !" —vol. i. p. 110.

We now take our leave of Mr. Elliott,\* under the full conviction that the popularity which he has acquired, notwithstanding his genius, is chiefly attributable to his station in society, and will not maintain itself by rearing the defect, which it has been our province to point out,—the most important of which, we fear, are incurable.

ART. XIII.—*Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, by Henry Lord Bishop of Exeter, at his triennial Visitation, 1836.* London: 8vo.

2. *Observations on the Roman Catholic Oath.* By a Roman Catholic. Ridgway. London, 1837. 8vo.

DR. PHILPOTTS, we believe, at his consecration, undertook a solemn obligation, "to act with gentleness and charity." In the course of last year he exemplified this "gentleness and charity," by addressing the following observations, from his episcopal throne, to his assembled clergy:—

"I will first remark on the bill entitled 'An Act for the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Revenues, and the Promotion of Religious and Moral Instruction in Ireland,'—in plain English, for seizing on the revenues of the Protestant church in Ireland, and applying them to some undefined purpose of teaching morality without religion, and religion without a creed. \* \* \* I cannot but congratulate you \* \* \* that those moderate funds, (for such they have been proved to be,) which the piety and wisdom of former ages have provided for the maintenance and extension of a pure faith throughout Ireland, have not become the prey of a perfidious faction, which could not have acquired the powers of mischief which unhappily they possess and exercise, but by entering into engagements, and binding them-

selves by pledges, which Englishmen and Protestants would deem it impossible for any who call themselves Christians to dare to violate. In the discussion of the measure in parliament, I felt it my duty to rest my resistance to it on this point,—to denounce as treachery, aggravated by perjury, such an exercise of rights, acquired under an oath ‘not to weaken or disturb the Protestant religion.’”

Such is a sample of the instruction delivered to the Anglican clergy, under the highest sanctions of their religion—within the walls of their cathedrals; promulgated with the deliberate energy of a second edition, and issued by a mighty champion of their orthodoxy—a sworn promoter of their *ideas of gentleness and charity*! Nor is the appeal unanswered: the accusation is hailed by an organ of that church, as the expression of “an indignation worthy of an English heart and a Christian prelate—the sentiment of every honest man.”\* So long as such charges were confined to the outpourings of postprandial orgies, and the well-paid declamation of political partizanship, we were content to believe that the object was to lessen the ministerial majority in parliament, by influencing the votes of the timid or the uninformed, and we—were silent: we were content to leave our fellow-countrymen to the operation of time and their own good sense, for the discovery of the absurdity of charging those, who were never excluded from the right to sit in parliament by any other barrier than AN OATH, with “*acquiring*” and exercising that right at the expense of “treachery aggravated by perjury.” But thanks to the very able writer in the *Quarterly Review*, whose views we have developed at some length in another article, we are satisfied that the charge is assuming real importance as an instrument for the promotion of the conspiracy against Catholic liberty, which we have exposed in that article. When under this conviction, we had determined to discontinue our silence, we were greatly rejoiced to discover that the very able writer whose pamphlet is the second in the list at the head of this article, had come to a similar determination, and we propose to avail ourselves very largely of his assistance.

The fundamental principle of the British Constitution in Church and State, is the free exercise of the elective franchise. This principle, founded in and pervading the canon and common law, regulated the great nurseries of liberty—the ecclesiastical and civil corporations. It was established in the constitution of all the monastic institutions of the kingdom. The annals of episcopal election, and particularly to the see of Canterbury, present some of the most remarkable examples of the exercise of

\* “Quarterly Review,” No. cxv. p. 240.

the right of election which are on record ; and although this right remains only in the name of the *cong  d' lire* in the Anglican establishment, yet the principle is preserved in its pristine vigour in the canons of the Catholic church. This principle has been happily restored in the regulation of the great civil corporations in England and Scotland, and its free admission into those of Ireland would remove one of her most signal causes for dissatisfaction. But it is in the construction of parliament that the constitution has in all ages most carefully guarded this sacred deposit of free and unfettered right of choice. We shall not pause to enquire whether, in the days of its greatest purity, any qualification was required in the elector beyond the possession of his faculties—in the elected, beyond the choice of his fellow-subjects. Certain it is that that choice was never fettered or restrained in any age, with one solitary exception, to persons holding any particular opinions in religion or politics. Nor was this in theory only ; for to take one of the earliest examples, we know that the patrons and friends who attended Wiclif during his trial were lords of parliament ; and when the legislature attempted to restrain the progress of his opinions, after he had died in quiet possession of his rectory, no attempt was made to exclude the holders of those opinions from admission to the legislature. Then came the Reformation, with all its various changes and restrictions—its pains and penalties—its exclusions alike of Dissenters and Catholics ; yet the reigns of Henry, and Edward, and Mary, and Elizabeth, and James I, are alike silent as to any attempt to exclude from parliament either the Catholic or the Dissenter,—even though the mere fact of holding their opinions was penal : for the same Marquis of Winchester—whether Protestant with Edward, or pretended Catholic and active promoter of the punishment of Protestants under Mary, or again Protestant under Elizabeth—remained throughout his career a member of the legislature ; and during the reigns of Elizabeth and James I —notwithstanding the rigour of the laws which protected the establishment—notwithstanding the horror excited by the Gunpowder plot—the Catholics remained entitled to their seats in parliament, and the number of Catholics and Puritans who exercised that right was notoriously very great. Under the reign of Charles I, the constitution was overthrown by the influence of the Dissenters in the legislature. Then came the Restoration, and mark the result : although the loyalty of the Catholics was rewarded only with additional penalties on their religion, yet was there no attempt to exclude from parliament either the persecuted Catholic, or the lately triumphant but now prostrate Dissenter. The vigour of constitutional principle prevailed, and the Catholic

voices in the House of Peers are responsible for the re-admission of the bishops of the establishment into that body. We are now arrived at the darkest period of our constitutional history, and, but that it may serve as a beacon and a warning, well would it be if the history of Titus Oates and his abettors were blotted out of our annals. Its darkest spot is its invasion of the constitution by imposing a fetter on the free exercise of the elective franchise; but even in those worst of times, the form of the constitution was preserved—the Catholic remained eligible by his fellow-countrymen, and was excluded ONLY by the imposition of a test of opinions inconsistent with his faith: and had he been the monster of treachery and perjury which Dr. Philpotts has painted, would he ever have hesitated to take his seat in parliament as a peer, or when elected by any constituency?

The revolution was the forerunner of the removal of disabilities; and unhappily it introduced a new principle into our civil policy, which has led to infinite inconvenience—the annexation to the admission of parties, previously excluded, to the exercise of their rights, of oaths and declarations, by way of protection against the evils which had created that exclusion. The true principle of admission to office we believe to be as follows:—

“No man should be called upon to promise to do what he is bound by the duties of his office to perform; on the contrary, it should be every way declared, that every man has already promised to do his duty by the very act of accepting an office.” \*

This principle was unfortunately lost sight of at the Revolution; a form of Coronation Oath was adopted which led to most inconvenient discussions and differences of opinion; and every succeeding removal of any disability of either Catholic or dissenter, which took place between the Revolution and the Emancipation Act, was accompanied by some declaration or oath, which was supposed to be a protection and security against the recurrence of the evil in respect of which such disability had been created; but was by no means intended to fetter or restrain the party admitted in the full enjoyment of the privileges of the office to which he was admitted. The practice, once introduced, rapidly gained ground. The precedents of 1689, 1791, and 1793, were adopted in 1828: and the oath then imposed on the

---

\* Tyler on Oaths, p. 68,—a work to which we beg to call the attention of our readers, premising only that it contains, with much that is excellent, more than the usual cant about dark ages, &c., and more than the ordinary bigotry of abuse against the Catholics. And this is not the less remarkable from the close coincidence of many of its most able passages with the opinions of “dark age” Catholic writers. By way of illustration, we refer to Mr. Tyler’s chapter on the Definition of Oaths, as contrasted with the far more lucid statement of St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiæ*, 22<sup>a</sup> q. lxxxix. art. 1, on the same subject.

dissenter was imposed "because," in the language of Sir Robert Peel, "similar oaths had been formerly introduced." (See *Mirror of Parliament*, 1829, vol. ii. p. 914.)

In the year 1828, the whole of the disabilities affecting dissenters were removed; they were admitted to all civil employments, from the privy council downwards; but they had never been excluded from parliament. The extent to which, therefore, the new declaration was imposed upon them was commensurate with the extent to which they were admitted to privileges, and was addressed to the evil in respect of which they had been excluded, and as a safeguard against the recurrence to that evil, viz., danger to the Church Establishment and the rights of its bishops and clergy. Accordingly, all dissenters on being admitted to the privy council, or any other office from which they had been previously excluded (but in no other case), are required to make the following declaration:—

"I, A. B., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, upon the true faith of a Christian, that I will never exercise any power, authority, or influence which I may possess by virtue of the office of \_\_\_\_\_ to injure or weaken the Protestant Church as it is by law established in England, or to disturb the said Church, or the bishops and clergy of the said Church, in the possession of any rights or privileges to which such Church or the said bishops and clergy are or may be by law entitled." \*

Why was not this or some analogous declaration imposed on the dissenter on taking his seat in parliament? Is there no danger except from the Catholic? Is there no necessity for any security against the Unitarian, or even the Protestant himself? The reason was, that the dissenter was never excluded from parliament, and therefore no oath or declaration was imposed upon him on taking his seat.

In this state of circumstances the Emancipation Bill was passed. It found the Catholics excluded from parliament and various other civil offices, and "because, similar oaths had been formerly introduced," *their* admission to all these rights, including their admission to parliament, was fettered with the obligation of an oath, which was addressed to, and intended to be a security against, the evils in respect of which they had been excluded. Now, what were those supposed evils? *First*, Their supposed desire to recover the confiscated estates in Ireland; *Second*, Their supposed desire to recover the property of the Established Church; *Third*, Their supposed hostility to the Protestant religion, and their desire to build up the Catholic Church on its ruin; and accordingly the oath imposed upon them con-



tains three distinct clauses addressed to these three points, which we will hereafter examine seriatim. The question, then, is, how far does this oath affect the Catholic members of the legislature in the exercise of their legislative functions? for in any other regard we conceive there is no dispute as to its complete and universal obligation. But we contend, that, consistently with the integrity of the constitution, and the intention of the legislature imposing the oath, "the Catholic members could not be restrained from voting on any subject as they pleased." It was thought necessary—

"to have some security against their supposed hostility to the Protestant religion, and to bind them by a promise upon their oaths not to seek the injury of the Protestant religion, and make it a question between them and their consciences; and that they should promise not to vote to the prejudice of the Protestant religion, out of *mere hostility* to that religion. This is an obligation which, if imposed, nowise interferes with their parliamentary duty of legislating for the whole, or abridges their rights."

We will now proceed to establish this position, and for that purpose it is necessary to examine the Emancipation Act, first, as to what it does enact, and, secondly, as to what it does not enact. First, as to what it does enact:—

"I find a declaration of the legislature in the 10th section, 'That it shall be lawful for any of his majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion, to hold, exercise, and enjoy ALL civil and military offices and places of trust or profit under his majesty, his heirs or successors, and to exercise any other franchise or civil right, *except as hereinafter excepted*, upon taking and subscribing at the times and in the manner hereinafter mentioned, the oath hereinbefore appointed and set forth, *INSTEAD* of the oaths of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration, and instead of such other oath or oaths as are or may be now by law required to be taken for the purpose aforesaid by any of his majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion.'

Thus we see a general intention to admit the Catholics to the full enjoyment of the privileges of subjects. But was this admission to be subject to no restraints? Let us examine, and we shall find, that whenever

"it was intended to exclude them from the exercise of any privilege or power, the legislature has not failed to express its intent in *plain and distinct terms*; thus, by express words contained in the 15th section, they are excluded, as members of lay corporations, from voting or in any manner joining in any election, presentation, or appointment to any ecclesiastical benefice whatever, or any office or place belonging to or connected with the United Churches of England and Ireland, or the Church of Scotland, being in the gift, patronage, or disposal of such

lay corporate body; and again, by the 12th, 17th, 18th, and 25th sections, Catholics are excluded from the office of guardians and justices of the United Kingdom, and of regent of the United Kingdom, and lord high chancellor, lord keeper or lords commissioners of the great seal of Great Britain or Ireland, and of lord lieutenant, lord deputy, or other chief governor of Ireland, and of his majesty's high commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and from any right of presentation to any ecclesiastical benefice belonging to any office in the gift or appointment of his majesty, his heirs or successors, such office being held by a Catholic, and from directly or indirectly advising his majesty, his heirs or successors, or the lord lieutenant or lord deputy of Ireland, touching or concerning the appointment to or disposal of any office of preferment in the United Church of England or Ireland, or the Church of Scotland. But Catholic members are not excluded from voting or speaking on, or in any way restrained or fettered respecting questions relating to the Church, its revenues or property. What is the necessary conclusion? If whilst you find the legislature excluding, in many cases carrying that exclusion so far, and descending so low in the way of exclusion, as to prevent a Catholic mayor or sheriff from wearing his robes in a Catholic chapel, and that you do not find in the act an exclusion or a restraint upon Catholic members from voting on questions relating to the Church its revenues or property, what, I ask, is the inference, but that the legislature not only has not excluded, restrained, or fettered, but did not intend to exclude, restrain, or fetter them in voting on such questions?"\*

We think that we may safely call in aid the principle of law and common sense, that the specific enumeration of exceptions is the exclusion of all other exceptions, and that the omission of any exclusion from the right of voting, is conclusive; but may it not be that the omission was accidental? The proceedings in parliament show that, on the contrary, the very question was raised, discussed, considered, and decided in favour of there being no exclusion. Sir William Horton moved for a clause imposing a restraint, and his motion was rejected.

Sir Charles Wetherell, — than whom a more keen-sighted lawyer and statesman never appeared in parliament, — is reported to have expressed himself as follows:—"I would wish that some senior optime from Oxford, or some senior wrangler from Cambridge, would explain how this bill" (the Emancipation Bill, containing the oath in question) "is to bind a Roman Catholic in his LEGISLATIVE CAPACITY, in the discharge of his *parliamentary* DUTIES. I ask, do you or do you not, when you give the Roman Catholic LEGISLATURE power, restrain and restrict him from acting in his legislative capacity AS HE PLEASES?" Again, Sir Robert Peel is reported as having expressed himself

---

\* Observations, pp. 4, 5.

as follows.—“I am unwilling to DEPRIVE the Roman Catholic members of either house of parliament, of ANY privilege of FREE DISCUSSION and FREE EXERCISE of judgment, which belongs to OTHER members of the legislature.” And again, “I would admit them therefore ON the SAME FOOTING, THE SAME *principle of equality*, on which we now admit the dissenter from the Church of England.” And he adds, “*that it is dangerous to establish the precedent of limiting by law the discretion by which the duties and functions of a member of parliament are to be exercised.*”†

To apply these principles, we proceed to investigate “THE FOOTING” on which Protestant Dissenters are admitted into parliament. The conditions are, that they take the oath or affirmation of ALLEGIANCE, SUPREMACY, and ABJURATION, the declaration against transubstantiation being abolished. Now in perusing these declarations we look in vain for any restraint upon the absolute right of the Protestant Dissenter to speak or vote on every possible subject of legislation; and it is notorious that none such can be found; for who has ever charged Mr. Hume, or Mr. Warburton, or Mr. Wilks, with any violation of legislative duty by reason of their legislative attempts to interfere with ecclesiastical property or privileges?

Now, remember, it is Sir Robert Peel who has told us, in the true spirit of the constitution, that the terms imposed on the Catholic member are on the “*same footing, the same principle of equality*,” as those imposed on the Dissenter. How then is this equality maintained? Let us see. The legislature declares that, “INSTEAD of the oaths of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration,” taken by the Dissenting member of parliament, the Catholic member shall take the oath set forth in the act.”‡ Surely the fair inference from this enactment, coupled with the declarations of Sir Robert Peel and Sir Charles Wetherell, is that the Catholic oath should be *substantially equivalent* with the oaths imposed on the Dissenter; and we think it will require all the logic of “the Oxford senior optime,” and all the mathematics of “the Cambridge senior wrangler,” to show that Sir Robert Peel’s principle of EQUALITY is not violated if the Dissenter remains unfettered in his vote, NOTWITHSTANDING he has taken his oaths, while the Catholic is fettered in his vote solely *because* he has taken an oath which was intended to be only of equivalent effect. And this construction gives a substantial effect to the oath when taken by the Catholic legislator, inasmuch as he is thereby bound in conscience not to vote on any measure merely

† Hansard, 1829, vol.xx. p. 1573.

‡ 10 Geo. IV. c. 10, § 2.

from hostility to the Protestant religion, and without reference to the general good of the community for whom he is bound to act.

We now proceed to examine the oath itself, and in so doing we admit fully and explicitly that the party taking it, is bound to take it in the sense which in his conscience he believes to have been intended by the party imposing it. We are bound, however, to say that this principle has been applied most erroneously—it has been imagined that Sir Robert Peel was that party, but we assert that the true intent of the legislature in imposing this oath, must be collected by this, as it must necessarily be by every future generation, not from the perishable reports of the speeches or the opinions of statesmen, however distinguished, but from a consideration of the true nature and spirit of the enactment itself, which, however, be it remembered, (if authority were to decide the question,) was passed by the aid of a Grey, a Melbourne, a Holland, a Lansdowne, a Russell, a Palmerston, and of a host of other patriots, whose voices and votes were as potential as those of a Peel, and who too well understood the theory of the British constitution to insult its dignity by rendering its privileges *FELO DE SE*, in the very act of restoring them to the descendants of the founders of liberty.

In illustration of this principle we refer our readers to a legal decision which must command the sympathy and respect of all our opponents. Under an Act for regulating the process of the Court of Chancery, Lord Brougham was called upon to issue that process into Scotland. His lordship refused to make the order, NOT because the Act did not extend to Scotland, BUT because Lord Plunkett, the projector of the measure, *did not intend* that it should extend to Scotland. Lord Lyndhurst most properly reversed this decision, on the constitutional principle that the obvious construction of the Act itself was to be the rule of interpretation, to the utter exclusion of the opinion of its originator, Lord Plunkett.\*

The legislature then being the party imposing the oath, how do we arrive at its meaning and intention? By what it has said—by what it has not said—by the construction put upon Acts of Parliament made *in pari materia*. Now what is the oath? So far as concerns our argument, there are three clauses; *first*, “I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of PROPERTY within this realm *as established by the laws* ;” *second*, “I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the PRESENT church establishment, *as settled by law* within this realm ;” *third*, “I do solemnly swear

---

\* See *Cameron v. Cameron*, Cases in Chancery, Mylne & Keene, vol. ii. p. 289.

that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the PROTESTANT religion or the PROTESTANT government "in the united kingdom." The distinction between the first and second clauses is remarkable, the former being "bound to defend," the latter "disclaiming any intention to subvert." We think that it is satisfactorily made out† that the former clause refers not to the property of the church, which is specially alluded to in the second, but to the settlement of the confiscated and forfeited estates in Ireland, nearly the whole island having been confiscated. But whether church property be or be not included in the first clause, it is manifestly included in the second clause, and both the clauses contain a reference to a settlement guaranteed by the law existing at the time of taking the oath. Now it is to be borne in mind that the oath is taken not only by Catholic members, but by Catholic barristers, solicitors, and corporators, and all functionaries, from the privy councillor to the constable. Now we contend that this reference to the existing state of the law as varying from time to time, necessarily saves the right of legislation for the purpose of bringing about or concurring in those variations; for supposing it to be otherwise, what would be the consequence? Suppose a barrister to have taken the oath, and the Protestant legislature to have altered any part of the settlement of property comprised in the two clauses, such barrister would clearly be bound to defend the settlement of property as altered, and lawfully altered, from time to time: but suppose the same barrister again to take the same oath on becoming a member of parliament, either he is bound to defend any alteration which may be made in the law, whether he votes or not in respect of such alteration, or he is not so bound. If he is bound to defend the alteration, then he is debarred as a member of parliament from voting in that very alteration which, when voted, he is bound to defend; that is, he is debarred from voting upon almost every possible subject of legislation which comes within the designation of property: if he is not so bound, then his barristers' oath, and his oath as a member, are directly at variance. Now, to suppose that all Catholic members are prevented from concurring in any alteration in the law of descent, limitation of actions, abolishing fines and recoveries, of bills of poor-laws for England and Ireland, seems too absurd to be contended; and yet they are all subjects comprised within "the settlement of property," and all therefore within the terms of the oath, and all therefore subjects on which Catholics cannot vote unless their legislative function is saved, and it is quite cer-

---

† Observations, p. 16 et seq.

tain that that function can be saved only, either by virtue of the reference in the oath to the progressive changes in the law regulating property, or on the general ground that the oath does not affect the legislative function. Now on either of these grounds, it is clear that the second clause—which relates to church property—must present neither more nor less than precisely the same difficulty that is presented by the first clause; for, if it be lawful to vote on the law of wills, which comes within clause one, it is lawful to do so on one of the two grounds we have mentioned, and in that case it is lawful to vote in relation to church property, which is alluded to in clause two on precisely the same grounds; but if it be unlawful to vote in respect of church property because it is within clause two, for precisely the same reasons it is unlawful to vote as to the law of wills, which is within clause one. Now mark the consequence—in the event (possible in contemplation of law) of the whole legislature being Catholic—the legislative function of the whole nation would be destroyed, upon every possible subject comprehended within the words “settlement of property,” if the legislative function be not saved; and if it be saved, then it is saved for all purposes of legislation upon the subject of church property, as the subject of the second clause. We think then it is pretty clear, upon the consideration of the act itself, that the legislative function must necessarily be saved as to the whole of the subjects, lay or ecclesiastical, within the two first clauses; but how stands the matter when considered, first with reference to general principles, and second with reference to the constructions which have been put upon similar acts in *pari materiâ*? Now as to general principles, we assert that any limitation of the legislative function is inconsistent with the constitution; and that no party, in passing the Emancipation Act, contemplated any such limitation or violation of the constitution.

“As to the first proposition we have the authority of Lord Kenyon, in one of his letters to King George III, that ‘it is a great maxim that the supreme power of the state cannot limit itself.’ But if you limit any portion of the supreme power, you are limiting the supreme power itself.”\*

The British legislature, Sir William Blackstone (vol. i. p. 161) observes—

“Can do every thing that is not naturally impossible; and therefore some have not scrupled to call its power by a figure rather too bold—the omnipotence of parliament. True it is, what the parliament doth no authority on earth can undo.”

---

\* Observations, p. 10.

And again he informs us that the legislature may be called upon .

“To regulate or new model the succession to the crown, as was done in the reigns of Henry VIII and William III; or to alter the established religion of the land, as was done in a variety of instances in the reigns of King Henry VIII and his three children; or to change and create afresh even the constitution of the kingdom and of parliament themselves, as was done by the acts of union, and the several statutes for triennial and septennial election.”—*Ibid.*

The importance and uncontrollable nature of the function of legislation, coupled with the absence of any express, and the difficulty of discovering any implied, limitation of that function in the Catholic oath, suggests an argument of the greatest weight, to which we cannot do justice on the present occasion—we mean the conflict of duties in which the Catholic may find himself involved. According to Burke, and all political writers, the member “is not the member for Bristol,” but the member for the whole community—the trustee of the rights of the whole constituency of England; and any failure on his part in the exercise of that trust, *from whatever cause*, is an injury to the whole constituency of the empire. The moment he is elected (according to Mr. Tyler) he is involved in the obligation of performing ALL the duties of his office, and the PEOPLE have the *right to demand* from him the *performance of all those* duties, or to resign, *and it is his duty to obey*. It seems obvious that the legislature could not intend the mockery of making it the duty of the Catholic to *resign* the moment any question of religion is mooted—or, in other words, on the day he takes his seat—if any hostile member should so desire. It is then to be presumed that it was the intention of the legislature that the Catholic, when allowed to be a member, should do his duty—the *whole of his duty*. How far, therefore, regard being had to the RIGHTS of the constituency to elect a Catholic member and to require him to perform his duty, such member can be considered to be BOUND by any oath which may interfere with the performance of his duty, is an important consideration, to which we cannot now devote sufficient attention. We may however observe, that Grotius (if we correctly remember a passage quoted by Dr. Doyle, in his Letters on Catholic Claims, to which we have not immediate access) lays down the broad principle, “that any oath which is inconsistent with the full discharge of the lawful duties of a lawful office, is of no obligation;” and we are certain that the Archbishop of Canterbury, (whose example we have elsewhere quoted,) on the recent debate on the Universities Commission Bill in the House of Lords, laid

down the doctrine that the obligation of an oath might be superseded by that of a higher and inconsistent duty.

Such being the nature of the legislative function, we will enquire what is the construction which has been put upon other oaths, with reference to their effect in limiting that function, and upon this subject we have abundant authority, and we will refer to one or two examples. And first as to the oath of succession (1 Geo. I. stat. 2, cap. 13,) which is adopted into the Catholic oath, and contains the following clause:—

“And I do faithfully promise to the utmost of my power, to support, maintain, and defend the succession of the Crown, which for better securing the rights and liberties of the subject is and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, of Hanover, and *the heirs of her body being Protestant.*”

Blackstone was doubtless well aware of the existence of this oath, when he stated that parliament could alter the succession of the Crown, and yet ALL the members of the legislature, by whose votes alone that alteration, if requisite, could be made, must necessarily have taken that oath before they could vote upon any such alteration; and yet who can doubt that if any one of the “*heirs of the body of the Princess Sophia,*” should pursue a career of such perverted ambition or profligacy, as to make his conduct the object of universal suspicion and abhorrence, all parties, whether Catholic or Protestant, might lawfully combine in the legislative duty of new-modelling the succession without being charged with treason or perjury.

The following passages are contained in the coronation oath, (1 Wm. & Mary, c. 6.):—

“Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant reformed religion established by law, and will you *preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the CHURCHES committed to their charge, ALL such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them or any of them?* All this I promise to do.”

Now assuredly it cannot be contended that (setting apart the King's LEGISLATIVE capacity) this oath can be reconciled with the annihilation of bishopricks! and yet who has charged the King with perjury for assenting to the Church Temporalities Act, by which TEN bishopricks are annihilated? or to the enactment depriving the see of Durham of its most glorious privileges?

The importance of the subject will justify us in quoting the following passages:—

“It should be stated that every objection now urged to the Catholic member exercising his judgment and discretion on all questions relating



to the Church, its revenues and property, was made to the propriety of their Majesties, King George the Third and Fourth, giving their assents to Catholic emancipation. But Lord Eldon informed his late Majesty, King George the Third, 'That it was not incumbent on his Majesty to refuse his assent to the repeal of the acts affecting Roman Catholic subjects, when the houses of parliament in proposing that repeal considered it for the benefit of the country,' and Lord Lyndhurst in one of the debates on the Catholic question declared, 'that with regard to the coronation oath, he would merely say that he perfectly concurred in the opinions expressed by the father of the noble lord (Kenyon) in his correspondence on this subject. Since the period when that correspondence took place, the arguments which had been raised regarding the coronation oath had been so much derided and laughed at, that they had never been revived until of late. They had never been adopted by the late Lord Liverpool in opposing this question, nor by the right hon. gentleman in the other house of parliament, his Majesty's Secretary for home affairs. They always scouted such an argument.'—(*Hansard*, 1829, vol. xxi. p. 213.)

"In the opinions, therefore, of Lord Eldon and Lord Lyndhurst, the coronation oath did not attach on his Majesty in his legislative capacity. In his executive capacity the monarch is clearly bound."\*

"If, then, the coronation oath was not considered to be binding on his late Majesty, King George the Third, so as to prevent his giving his assent to the bill restoring the elective franchise to the Irish Catholics, or on his late Majesty, King George the Fourth, so as to prevent his giving his assent to the general Emancipation Act for English and Irish Catholics; and if the coronation oath was not considered to be binding on his present gracious Majesty, so as to prevent his giving his assent to the Irish Temporalities Act, upon what ground, I ask, can it be successfully contended that the Catholic member in his legislative capacity, is prevented by the oath contained in the Emancipation Act from giving his assent to the Irish Tithe Bill, as brought forward by ministers, or the church-rate resolutions."†

We will adduce only one more illustration from the construction which has been affixed on other oaths as affecting the legislative capacity.

"There is an awkward passage," says Mr. Sydney Smith,‡ "in the memorial of the Church of Canterbury, which deserves some consideration from him to whom it is directed. The Archbishop of Canterbury, at his consecration, takes a solemn oath that he will maintain the rights, and liberties of the Church of Canterbury; as Chairman, however, of the New Commission, he seizes the patronage of that Church, takes two-thirds of its revenues, and abolishes two-thirds of its members. That there is an answer to this I am very willing to believe, but I cannot at present find out what it is; and this attack upon the revenues, and members of Canterbury, is not obedience to an act of parliament, but the

\* Observations, pp. 22-23.

† Observations, pp. 24-25.

‡ "Letter to Archdeacon Singleton," p. 9.

very act of parliament which takes away is recommended, drawn up, and signed by the person who has sworn he will never take away; and this little apparent inconsistency is not confined to the Archbishop of Canterbury, but is shared equally by all the Bishop Commissioners, who have all (unless I am grievously mistaken) taken similar oaths for the preservation of their respective chapters. It would be more easy to see our way out of this little embarrassment, if some of the embarrassed had not unfortunately, in the parliamentary debates on the Catholic Question, laid the greatest stress upon the King's oath, applauded the sanctity of the monarch to the skies, rejected all comments, called for the oath in its plain meaning, and attributed the safety of the English Church to the solemn vow made by the King at the altar to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the other bishops. I should be very sorry if this were not placed on a clear footing, as fools will be imputing to our Church the *pia et religiosa Calliditas*, which is so commonly brought against the Catholics.

Urbem quam dicunt Romam Melibæ putavi  
Stultus ego huic nostræ similem.

The words of Henry VIII., in endowing the Cathedral of Canterbury, are in the translation. 'We, therefore, dedicating the aforesaid close, site, circle, and precinct, to the honour and glory of the holy and undivided Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, have decreed that a certain cathedral and metropolitan church, with one dean, presbyter, and twelve prebendaries presbyters; these verily and for ever to serve Almighty God shall be created, set up, settled, and established; and the same aforesaid cathedral and metropolitan church, with one dean, presbyter, and twelve prebendaries presbyters, with other ministers, necessary for divine worship by the tenor of these presents in reality and plentitude of force, we do create, set up, settle, and establish, and do command to be established and to be in perpetuity, and inviolably maintained and upheld by these presents.' And this is the Church, the rights and liberties of which the archbishop at his consecration swears to maintain. Nothing can be more ill-natured among politicians, than to look back into Hansard's Debates, to see what has been said by particular men upon particular occasions, and to contrast such speeches with present opinions—and therefore I forbear to introduce some inviting passages upon taking oaths in their plain and obvious sense, both in the debates on the Catholic Question and upon that fatal and *Mezentian* oath which binds the Irish to the English Church."

For our parts, we think there is no difficulty in justifying the archbishop, but we can do it only on the ground, that his oath was by no means inconsistent, with the full and free exercise of his legislative capacity.

The conclusion which we draw from considering the two first clauses of the oath, with reference to the act in which they are contained, to the general principles of the constitution, and the construction which has been put upon other oaths under similar circumstances is, that neither of these clauses has the effect of

limiting the legislative function in respect to either civil or ecclesiastical property. There remains only the third clause to be considered; "I do solemnly swear, that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am, or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant Religion or Government in the United Kingdom."\*

"Now, surely it will not be said that in this oath the 'Church establishment,' and 'Protestant religion' are synonymous terms, or mean the same thing; and surely it will not be contended, that if the Church establishment was subverted, the Protestant religion would disappear. They are not used in the act as synonymous terms; on the contrary, a distinction is taken by the act. Mark the three different gradations:—

---

\* We have thought it right to keep our argument unfettered by any comments on the vagueness, (to Catholics at least,) of the terms in which the oath is couched. What is "the Protestant Religion in the United Kingdom?" Take the four following definitions, which we extract from "Dialogues on the Catholic and Protestant Rules of Faith," by James Smith, Esq. (Edinburgh, 1831.) pp. 5 and 11, one Catholic and three Protestant. (1.) "Protestantism," says Dr. Fletcher, "is not a term implying any system of faith, or any belief whatever, it is a term which has no fixed or determined signification—a mere *nomen infinitum*, which means any thing or every thing except Catholic. It is a term not expressing faith, but the want of faith. Thus, not only the Socinian, the Arian, &c., are Protestants, but the Deist, the Jew, the very Atheist, since all these protest against Popery, are just equally real Protestants, as are the believers in the Thirty-nine Articles." (2.) "Protestantism," says Mr. Burke, "as things stand, is no description of a religion at all, or any principle, religious, moral, or political, but is a mere negation." (3.) "Protestantism," says Dr. Burgess in his Protestant's Catechism, "is the abjuration of Popery." (4.) "By The Protestant Faith," says Chillingworth, "I do not understand the doctrine of Luther, or Calvin, or Melancthon, nor the confession of Augusta or Geneva, or the catechism of Heidelberg, nor the Articles of the Church of England, no, nor the harmony of Protestant confessions; but that wherein they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony, as a perfect rule of their faith and actions, that is the Bible—and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants." All this is puzzling enough for a Protestant—still more for a Catholic, especially when he is obliged to square and regulate his conscience according to *some* definition.—Let us try to solve the difficulty, and insert Chillingworth's definition in the oath,—“I swear that I will never exercise any privilege . . . to disturb or weaken the Protestant Religion . . . in the united kingdom, i. e., to 'disturb or weaken the religion contained in the Bible only, in the united kingdom.'” Now, suppose the question to be the abolition of Episcopacy; the Scotch Kirk—the Irish Presbyterians—the English Dissenters, cannot find it in the Bible. The Anglicans can. Or, suppose it were contemplated to abolish Infant Baptism or even the Sacraments,—the Baptists cannot find the former, the Quakers cannot find the latter in the Bible,—the Anglicans can. How is the poor Catholic to decide which of these opinions is "the Protestant religion?" It is obvious, his own opinions on the points in question cannot be his guide, and that the legislature has required him to decide a point as to the contending Protestant sects, which they themselves cannot determine. Considering that the Anglican Church and the Kirk are equally "Church Establishments as settled by law within this realm," it seems to be by no means easy to decide upon the duty of a Catholic member, (if he be bound in his legal active capacity by the oath), who should happen to represent an English borough, and immediately afterwards a Scotch county, during the progress through Parliament, of bills to extend Episcopacy to Scotland, and to introduce the establishment of the Kirk into England. As only one established religion is mentioned in the oath, it seems to us, that the Scotch member would be bound to stand by the Kirk only, and the English member by the Anglican Church only.

the Catholic member is bound to *defend the settlement of property* as established by law; he *disclaims* an intention to subvert the *Church establishment* as settled by law; and, he undertakes not to exercise his privilege to *weaken or subvert the Protestant religion*.\*

But assuming the "Protestant religion" to be synonymous with the "Church Establishment," and that we have made good our position that the Catholic legislator is entitled to vote upon all questions relating to the property of the Established Church, it would seem to be a necessary consequence of his concurring in any alteration or modification of that property, that he will have thereby disturbed the Protestant religion, and that consequently, unless his legislative character be excepted in the third clause of the oath, the three clauses are inconsistent. If they are not synonymous, it appears to us to be clear, that the only effect of this latter clause is to bind the conscience of the member to exercise his privilege of voting upon any question connected with the Protestant religion in such manner as he believes to be best for the public at large, in the exercise of his own uncontrollable and unscrutinable discretion; bearing only in mind, that by his oath he is prohibited from allowing himself to be in any degree influenced by any private sentiment of hostility or hatred towards the Protestant religion:—

"This construction of the oath does not contravene any law or principle of the constitution, and the object of the legislature is obtained, viz., that of putting the Catholic member on a level with the Protestants and Dissenter, by disarming him of his supposed hostility to the Protestant religion."†

The *Observer* has an ingenious argument on the sense in which the word "privilege" is used in the oath; the whole clause is taken from the oath of 1793, and is shown, we think, most satisfactorily and of necessity to prohibit nothing more than the *unlawful use* of any privilege—from which it is inferred that as no legislative function can be unlawful, the clause could in no case prohibit the exercise of that function. We beg to call the especial attention of our readers to the whole of this argument, the development of which would require more space than we can spare.‡

But if the oath do not affect the privileges of the legislator in his legislative character, has he not any privileges in the regulation and exercise of which he can be affected by his oath, except to the extent we have mentioned? We reply by asking another question, what is the "power, authority, or influence," of the office of a dissenting exciseman, "to injure or weaken the Pro-

\* Observations, pp. 26-27.

† Ibid. p. 29.

‡ Ibid. p. 27, et seq.

testant Church, or to disturb the bishops and clergy in the possession of their rights and privileges?"\* It seems to us to be very manifest that the privileges (not legislative) which are possessed by the Catholic peers and members of parliament, are as great and as capable of being exercised to the injury of the establishment, as the privileges of the dissenting exciseman; and that there is as little absurdity in imposing the one oath (even though it did not bind the legislator) as in insisting upon the other. Surely the peer's right of private audience as an hereditary councillor to the King, and the privy-councillor's right of advising on ANY possible subject of state policy, is as capable of being misapplied, and as much requires the restraint of an oath as the right of the dissenting magistrate or town councillor to regulate the affairs of constables and publicans, and that therefore the mere fact of the oath being required to be taken by the member, is by no means conclusive of its obligation on his legislative conscience, by reason of there being no other sufficient subject matter for the oath to operate upon.

We think that this important subject is developed with great clearness and ability by the author whom we have so largely quoted, in his admirable remarks upon the discretion which he shows to be vested in the legislator after he has taken the oath. Our limits prohibit more than a reference to these arguments, and the quotation of the following remarks:—

"These interpretations of the oath were made in the presence of Sir Robert Peel, and not denied or contradicted by him. I have then the authority of Lord Eldon and Lord Kenyon, in respect of the coronation oath, and of Lord Althorp, Lord Stanley, and Mr. Ferguson, in respect of the oath in question, that a discretion is vested in the Catholic, by which he is made the judge, whether by any bill about to be passed he intends to subvert the Church Establishment, and whether such bill will have the effect of weakening or disturbing the Protestant religion or Protestant government in the United Kingdom. The individual member then is the judge—the sole judge—no one else has a right to adjudicate upon the point. When he is satisfied, who has a right to question his determination? It is a question between him and his God. There is no arbiter or medium. And no frail mortal should claim to interfere, for if interference be claimed, what becomes of the discretion? And if such interference cannot be claimed, who has the right to say, that the Catholic Member has done wrong in voting for the resolutions respecting Church Rates, or the appropriation clause in the Irish Tithe Bill? If the Catholic Members have done wrong, according to his reasoning, the advisers of His late Majesty, King George the Fourth, did wrong in advising His Majesty to consent to Catholic Emancipation. And who were such advisers? The Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel. If the Catholic Members have done

wrong, the advisers of his late Majesty, King George the Fourth, did wrong in advising His Majesty to assent to the act relating to the Bishoprick of Durham, and the appropriation of such lands for founding a university. And who were such advisers? The Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, and Lord Lyndhurst. If the Catholic members have done wrong, the advisers of His present Majesty, in advising him to assent to the Irish Church Temporalities' Act, whereby ten bishopricks in Ireland and all benefices in which Divine Service had not been performed for three years before, are, or are liable to be, suppressed; and by which the Church Rates in Ireland are abolished, and a tax put upon all livings to answer the purposes of a Church Rate; and by which provisions relating to Church Lands, similar in substance, though not entirely in detail, were enacted. And who were such advisers? Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham. If the Catholic Members have done wrong, the Church Commissioners have done wrong in recommending, and His Majesty's Ministers in advising, His Majesty to give his assent to the Church Bill of last year, whereby so great an alteration has been made in the rights and privileges annexed and appertaining unto the bishops and clergy of this realm. And who were these commissioners? (Amongst others) the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of London. And who voted for that measure? All the bishops in the House of Lords, and Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, Sir James Graham, Mr. Estcourt, Mr. Goulburn, and Mr. Law, in the House of Commons. If the individual member is not to be the sole judge, in whom is the discretion to be placed, or is there to be no discretion? If there be no discretion, the Catholic member is bound to vote on all occasions against any alteration, against the bishops, against the party calling itself the Church party, against the will of the king, the supreme head of the Church of England, in case any alteration should be considered necessary by any of these parties in the Establishment. But, as there is to be a discretion, by whom is it to be exercised? By the party taking the oath, as stated by Lord Eldon, Lord Kenyon, Lord Althorp, and Lord Stanley, or by whom else? Any individual member? Is such member pointed out by the act? Who is he? Is he defined? Is it Lord John Russell or Sir Robert Peel? The minister of the day, or the head of the opposition? Is it Sir James Graham sitting on the ministerial side, or Sir James Graham, sitting on the opposition benches? Is it Sir James Graham voting for the Irish Temporalities' Act, or Sir James Graham voting against the Church Rate resolution? Is it Sir John Wrottesley voting for the Irish Temporalities' act, and the appropriation clause in the Irish Tithe Bill, or voting against the Church Rate resolution? If such be the test, the Catholic member must have done right in voting for the Irish Temporalities' act; for if it be considered that he has acted wrong in voting for the Church Rate resolution, inasmuch as both Sir James Graham and Sir John Wrottesley voted against it, surely it must be conceded that he did right in voting

---

\* We have not space to notice the very able arguments by which the *Observer* supports the Catholic votes on these subjects. They appear to us to throw very great, and as we think, new light on these important topics.

for the 'Irish Temporalities' act, as both the honourable members voted for it; and yet he was as much abused for this vote as he is for his vote on the Church Rate resolutions and the Appropriation Clause. Is it by a majority of the house? You would thereby be disfranchising the constituencies of the Catholic members, by a vote of the House of Commons; and if that majority was for the subversion of the Establishment, what would become of the security of the oath? No! the discretion must necessarily be placed in the individual member, and was by the act accordingly so placed; and that being the true intent and meaning of the act, I ask is it fair, is it just, to arraign the Catholic member for his exercise of that discretion? It is the more unjustifiable, looking at what occurred, and the discussions which took place, previously to the passing of the act, as to the coronation oath, and the correspondence between his late majesty King George the Third and Lord Kenyon, published in 1827. Is it then fair to contend that no such discretion is vested in the Catholic members, and this without being able to say in whom else the discretion is placed? For my own part, I think exclusion altogether would have been much more generous towards the Catholic. You admit him, as you say, into the constitution: you tell him he is emancipated, and yet you lay a snare for his conscience; and if he exercises that right which the act and constitution confer on him, he is liable to be called a perjurer by any individual who differs from him in opinion. The attempt to run down the Catholic in this matter is base and disgraceful. It is unjust in the extreme; it is unwise; as the only effect it can have is to irritate and disgust the Catholic member with those calling themselves the friends, but who, in my opinion, are the great enemies of the Church. But for the insolence engendered by the penal code towards the Catholics, such calumnies would never have been thought of. The Catholic members have never shunned, on the contrary, they have always courted and required, examination and investigation as to the meaning of this oath, declaring they would prefer being excluded from Parliament if such was the will of the legislature; but that whilst there, they would insist upon all the rights and the exercise of all the duties, of members of Parliament, according to their own discretion and judgment, and according to the constitution."†

Away, then, with the cant and hypocrisy which would PRESUME and INFER us out of those liberties and privileges, which have been inherited from the Catholic heroes of Runnymede! We call upon our Catholic legislators, as the representatives of those heroes, as the guardians and protectors of those liberties and privileges, to repudiate and shake off the calumnies with which they are assailed, and to claim as their RIGHT the SAME fair construction of THEIR oaths and conduct which good sense and constitutional knowledge have long since put upon the oaths and conduct of our Protestant kings and Protestant legislators. And we doubt not that our Protestant fellow-subjects will soon

be brought to treat with equal and merited contempt the calumnious "charges" of a Philpotts, and the malignant ravings of a McGhee or an O'Sullivan, and to be equally indifferent whether "Perjury" or "No Popery" be the watchword of our opponents.\*

\* The Times of the 20th ulto. having in a long paragraph, endeavoured to deduce a charge of perjury from certain writings of Roman Catholics, amongst which were some publications of Mr. Howard of Corby Castle; that gentleman sent the following letter to the self-dubbed "Leading Journal," but the conductors of that *consistent and impartial* "public instructor," declined to insert it.

To the Editor of the Times.

Corby Castle, Carlisle, 25th March, 1837.

SIR—I find myself alluded to in your paper of the 20th instant, and I trust you will allow me to be the interpreter of my own sentiments.

It does not appear necessary that I should follow you in the lengthened tracery of what those in chains may, for relief, have been willing to submit to, nor what those trained to oppression and persecution, so pertinaciously refused, until their fears that those chains might be broken on their own heads, induced them to concede. The unfortunate state of Ireland must be looked upon as retribution and punishment for misrule, and the perpetrators ought to bewail in penitence, sackcloth, and ashes, the effects of their own misgovernment, and deem themselves deprived of public confidence and unfit to rule over us.

But the point is, What effect the present Catholic Oath ought to have on the conscientious Catholic, both in his private station and in any office of trust or profit in which he may be placed? To me it is clear, that its objects and bearing resemble the Oath of Allegiance, and bind us neither by force, nor publicly, nor privately, by cabal and conspiracy, to endeavour to subvert the religion by law established. But that any Englishman, feeling the value of our Constitution, should deem it intended to interfere with, or fetter any member of the Legislature, in the free exercise of his duties, according to whatever he believes to be the best for the country, is quite a surprise to me, and from the language used by the imposers of the Oath, and even by its opponents, I must acquit them of any such unconstitutional intention. Such a limitation to the right of opinion and of voting, such piecemeal legislation, would militate against the right of the crown to be assisted by the free voice, as well as against the rights of the country and of the constituency; it would also be destructive of all Parliamentary usage. Both Peers and Commons are called together "*De arduis tractandis*," for their judgment and decision; and the summons of the Peers and calls of the House of Commons, practically prove, that free opinions and free voting in all that relates to the welfare of the country, are the object, and ought to regulate the conduct of every member; and by the call of the Commons, every member may be compelled to assist in the decision of the subject brought before him—and the closing of doors is not without precedent.

Whether the measure respecting Church Rates, be or be not advantageous to the Established Church, is a matter of opinion; but Sir, as you have quoted me, may I beg you also to allow me to repeat what has been proved to have been the intention of the founders of the Establishment, that their grants of lands and tithes were a trust imposed on the clergy, and to be regulated in the distribution by the then existing canon law, which was enforced also by ancient enactment—namely, that one-third of that revenue should be employed for the use of the poor—another for the support of the edifices and service of the Churches—and one third part only for the use of the minister. If these rules have been set aside, by those who have accepted the foundations, are the laity to class this among the benefits of the Reformation?

• I remain, Sir, your's. •

HENRY HOWARD.



ART. XIV.—*Declaration of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland.* 12mo. Dublin, 1835.

IN our first number, (ART. XII) we inserted the Declaration of the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars-Apostolic, and their co-adjutors in Great Britain; and in fulfilment of the pledge therein made, we now give the Declaration of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Catholic Church in Ireland. We now repeat what we before stated, that it is by these expositions of our faith that we desire to be judged; and we utterly repudiate and reject any doctrines, principles or practices, which are or may be imputed to us, incompatible with these declarations.

“ DECLARATION

*Of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland.*

“ At a time when the spirit of calm inquiry is abroad, and men seem anxious to resign those prejudices, through which they viewed the doctrines of others, the Archbishops and Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, avail themselves, with pleasure, of this dispassionate tone of the public mind, to exhibit a simple and correct view of those tenets, that are most frequently misrepresented. If it please the Almighty that the Catholics of Ireland should be doomed to continue in the humbled and degraded condition in which they are now placed, they will submit with resignation to the Divine will. The Prelates, however, conceive it a duty which they owe to themselves, as well as to their Protestant fellow-subjects, whose good opinion they value, to endeavour once more to remove the false imputations that have been frequently cast upon the faith and discipline of that Church which is entrusted to their care, that all may be enabled to know with accuracy, the genuine principles of those men, who are proscribed by law, from any participation in the honours, dignities, and emoluments of the State.

“ 1.—Established for promoting the happiness of mankind, to which order is essential, the Catholic religion, far from interfering with the constituted authorities of any State, is reconcilable with every regular form which human governments may assume. Republics as well as monarchies have thriven where it has been professed; and, under its protecting influence, any combination of those forms may be secure.

“ 2.—The Catholics in Ireland, of mature years, are permitted to read authentic and approved translations of the Holy Scriptures, with explanatory notes; and are exhorted to use them in the spirit of piety, humility, and obedience. The Clergy of the Catholic Church, are bound to the daily recital of a canonical office, which comprises in the course of a year, almost the entire of the sacred volume; and her Pastors are required, on Sundays and on Festivals, to expound to the faithful, in the vernacular tongue, the epistle or gospel of the day, or some other portion of the divine law.

" 3.—Catholics believe that the power of working miracles has not been withdrawn from the Church of God. The belief, however, of any particular miracle not recorded in the revealed word of God, is not required as a term of Catholic Communion, though there are many so strongly recommended to our belief, that they cannot without temerity be rejected.

" 4.—Roman Catholics revere the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, and piously invoke their intercession. Far, however, from honouring them with divine worship, they believe that such worship is due to God alone, and that it cannot be paid to any creature without involving the guilt of idolatry.

" 5.—Catholics respect the images of Christ and of his Saints, without believing that they are endowed with any intrinsic efficacy. The honour which is paid to these memorials, is referred to those whom they represent; and should the faithful, through ignorance, or any other cause, ascribe to them any divine virtue, the Bishops are bound to correct the abuse, and rectify their misapprehensions.

" 6.—The Catholic Church, in common with all Christians, receives and respects the entire of the ten commandments, as they are found in Exodus and Deuteronomy. The discordance between Catholics and Protestants on this subject, arises from the different manner in which these divine precepts have been arranged.

" 7.—Catholics hold, that, in order to attain salvation, it is necessary to belong to the true Church, and that heresy or a wilful and obstinate opposition to revealed truth, as taught in the Church of Christ, excludes from the Kingdom of God. They are not, however, obliged to believe, that all those are wilfully and obstinately attached to error, who, having been seduced into it by others, or who having imbibed it from their parents, seek the truth with a cautious solicitude, disposed to embrace it when sufficiently proposed to them; but leaving such persons to the righteous judgment of a merciful God, they feel themselves bound to discharge towards them, as well as towards all mankind, the duties of charity and of social life.

" 8.—As Catholics in the Eucharist adore Jesus Christ alone, whom they believe to be truly, really, and substantially present, they conceive they cannot be consistently reproached with idolatry, by any Christian who admits the divinity of the Son of God.

" 9.—No actual sin can be forgiven at the will of any Pope, or any Priest, or any person whatsoever, without a sincere sorrow for having offended God, and a firm resolution to avoid future guilt, and to atone for past transgressions. Any person who receives absolution without these necessary conditions, far from obtaining the remission of his sins, incurs the additional guilt of violating sacrament.

" 10.—Catholics believe that the precept of sacramental confession flows from the power of forgiving and retaining sins, which Christ left to his Church. As the obligation of confession, on the one hand, would be nugatory without the correlative duty of secrecy on the other, they believe that no power on earth can supersede the divine obligation of that seal, which binds the confessor not to violate the secrets of auricular con-

fession. Any revelation of sins, disclosed in the tribunal of penance, would defeat the salutary ends for which it was instituted, and would deprive the ministers of religion of the many opportunities which the practice of auricular confession affords, of reclaiming deluded persons from mischievous projects, and causing reparation to be made for injuries, done to persons, property, or character.

"11.—The Catholics of Ireland not only do not believe, but they declare upon oath, that they detest as unchristian and impious, the belief "that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under the pretence of their being heretics;" and also the principle "that no faith is to be kept with heretics." They further declare, on oath, their belief, that "no act in itself unjust, immoral, or wicked, can ever be justified or excused by or under pretence or colour that it was done either for the good of the Church, or in obedience to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever;" "that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither are they thereby required to believe, that the pope is infallible;" and that they do not hold themselves "bound to obey any order in its own nature immoral, though the pope or any ecclesiastical power should issue or direct such an order; but, on the contrary, that it would be sinful in them to pay any respect or obedience thereto."

"12.—The Catholics of Ireland swear, that they "will be faithful and bear true allegiance, to our most gracious sovereign lord King George the Fourth; that they will maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of their power, the succession of the crown in his Majesty's family, against any person or persons whatsoever: utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance to any other person claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these realms;" that they "renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated by the pope and council, or by any authority of the See of Rome, or by any authority whatsoever, may be deposed and murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever;" and that they "do not believe that the pope of Rome or any other foreign prince, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm." They further solemnly "in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that they make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of their oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted by the pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, or any person whatever, and without thinking that they are, or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the pope or any persons or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning."

After this full, explicit, and sworn declaration, we are utterly at a loss to conceive on what possible ground we could be justly charged with bearing towards our most gracious Sovereign only a divided allegiance.

"13.—The Catholics of Ireland, far from claiming any right or title to forfeited lands, resulting from any right, title, or interest, which their ancestors may have had therein, declare upon oath "that they will defend

to the utmost of their power, the settlement and arrangement of property in this country, as established by the laws now in being." They also "disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure, any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, for the purpose of substituting a Catholic Establishment in its stead. And further, they swear that they will not exercise any privilege to which they are or may be entitled, to disturb and weaken the Protestant religion and Protestant government in Ireland."

"14.—Whilst we have in the foregoing declaration, endeavoured to state, in the simplicity of truth, such doctrines of our Church as are most frequently misunderstood or misrepresented amongst our fellow-subjects, to the great detriment of the public welfare, and of Christian charity; and whilst we have disclaimed anew, those errors or wicked principles which have been imputed to Catholics, we also avail ourselves of the present occasion, to express our readiness at all times to give, when required by the competent authority, authentic and true information upon all subjects connected with the doctrine and discipline of our Church; and to deprecate the injustice of having our faith and principles judged of by reports made of them, by persons either avowedly ignorant of, or but imperfectly acquainted with, the nature of our Church government, its doctrines, laws, usages, and discipline.

"This declaration we approve, subscribe, and publish, as well that those who have formed erroneous opinions of our doctrines and our principles, may be at length undeceived, as that you, dearly beloved, be made strong in that faith which you have inherited as 'the children of saints, who look for that life, which God will give to those that never changed their faith from him.' *Tob. ii. 18.*

"Reverend Brothers, beloved Children, 'Grace, mercy, and peace,' be to you, 'from God the Father, and from Christ Jesus our Lord.' *1 Tim. i. 2.*

" Patrick Curtis, D.D.  
 Oliver Kelly, D.D.  
 Farrell O'Reilly, D.D.  
 Peter M'Loughlin, D.D.  
 James Magauran, D.D.  
 Geo. T. Plunkett, D.D.  
 James Keating, D.D.  
 Charles Troy, D.D.  
 Edward Kiernan, D.D.  
 Patrick Kelly, D.D.  
 Cornelius Egan, D.D.  
 William Crolly, D.D.  
 Patrick Maguire, D.D.  
 Patrick M'Mahon, D.D.  
 John M'Hale, D.D.

Daniel Murray, D.D.  
 Robert Laffan, D.D.  
 J. O'Shaughnessy, D.D.  
 Thomas Costello, D.D.  
 Kieran Marum, D.D.  
 Peter Waldron, D.D.  
 John Murphy, D.D.  
 James Doyle, D.D.  
 P. M'Nicholas, D.D.  
 P. M'Gettigan, D.D.  
 Edmund French, D.D.  
 Thomas Cœn, D.D.  
 Robert Logan, D.D.  
 Patrick Burke, D.D.  
 John Ryan, D.D.

*Dublin, 25th Jan. 1826."*

---

ART. XV.—*Summary Review of French Catholic Literature, from September 1836 to March 1837.*

ONE of the principal defects chargeable upon modern Reviews is, the partial view which they afford of the literature of the day. Even that of our own country is but imperfectly treated, from the small number of works which claim their attention; but the deficiency is still more remarkable in regard to foreign publications, few of which reach our country, and fewer still can be noticed at any length. In the department of literature which more particularly interests us, we are anxious to remedy, as far as possible, this defect, by presenting from time to time a condensed view of the most remarkable works produced on the Continent. Often we shall be able to do little more than catalogue them; occasionally we shall add a short remark, to characterize them; sometimes we may indulge in a longer extract.

In France, where so much is published, we may have a fair idea of the state of public feeling from the tendencies of literature. Judging by this criterion, it is impossible to deny the growing interest which religion inspires. No class of writings, however, affords better tests for such an estimate than periodical publications. During the brief period to which we have limited our review, a new daily journal has appeared at Paris, professing strict catholic and religious principles. Its title is *L'Europe*, under the editorship of the Marquis de Jouffroy, with a joint-stock capital of 750,000 francs. Its first number appeared on the first day of the year. On the 15th of December appeared the first number of the *Revue religieuse et édifiante*, continued once a fortnight. Each number consists of 32 pages, and contains the matter of 150 in ordinary print. This work is under the patronage of several of the French bishops. Another ecclesiastical periodical, entitled *Le Catholicisme*, has been announced since the commencement of the year, and shares were to be raised to form a capital of 120,000 francs, guaranteeing seven per cent. interest. It is characterized as a "journal des intérêts du clergé." To this class, perhaps, we should refer the *Encyclopédie Catholique*, published by a society of learned men, under the direction of Count Walsh. It will be the most complete encyclopædia yet published in France. The eighth number appeared in the beginning of March.

THEOLOGY.

*Les Évangiles, &c.*, traduits de la Vulgate par De Sacy. This edition, coming out in numbers, is superbly illustrated, and exceedingly cheap (17f.) Another edition has besides appeared, embellished in the same manner, but not with equal good taste. We believe, too, that we can safely announce a third to appear soon, with illustrations by the first Christian artists of the day. The "Imitation" has been published in the same style, but the engravings are out of all character. Still, the multiplication of such handsome works, at such low prices, proves how much they are in demand.

*Histoire du Nouveau Testament et des Juifs, confirmée par l'histoire et par les sciences profanes.* Par M. l'Abbé James. 1 vol. 4to. with 38 engravings. 10f. 50c. A Life of Christ, which has received the approbation of the Archbishop of Paris, and the eulogies of all Catholic critics, from its combining varied information with the most devout spirit. The same author has just published, or is publishing,

*Dictionnaire de l'Ecriture Sainte.* 1 vol. 8vo. 7f. 50c. Four thousand subscribers had given their names upon the publication of the prospectus.

*Tabella synoptica triplicis Historiæ Christi viventis in figuris, prophetiis, et evangeliiis.* 6f. The title sufficiently describes this work, which is a chart on six sheets. The author is the Abbé Crozat.

The publication of St. Chrysostom's works, by Gaume, continues; as does that of St. Augustine's. But it is certainly a remarkable circumstance, that two editions, one with many additions, should be carried on at the same time. The other is the Abbé Caillau's, published by Parent-Desbarres, in about 35 volumes 8vo. of which 12 have appeared. An edition of St. Jerome's works is also in the press.

*Les Pères de l'Eglise, traduction Française, avec des Notices, &c.,* publiée par M. de Genoude. The first volume has appeared, and the entire work will form twenty large quartos, of 800 pages each. The indefatigable director of this work is well known as the proprietor of the *Gazette de France*, who has entered holy orders, and continues daily to give new evidence of the zeal which animated him to this step. He has lately published a new French version of the Bible.

*Cours complet d'Ecriture Sainte et de Théologie.* This work is really a useful and magnificent undertaking. It is under the direction of twenty-six French and twelve foreign clergymen; and five thousand letters of consultation have been written to distinguished theologians and bishops, all over Europe, for advice. The two courses go on at the same time; each will consist of 20 vols. large 8vo. in columns. Each series contains the most approved works upon every department of biblical and theological science, so as to form an eclectic course; and either may be subscribed to separately. The price is 5f. a volume. There is a series of premiums for persons who procure subscribers; beginning with entire works in one volume, for one additional subscriber, up to the entire works of St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom. The office for this publication is 7, Rue des Maçons-Sorbonne, Paris.

In the catechetical department of theology the following works have appeared:—The third edition of the *Catéchisme Raisonné, historique et dogmatique, à l'usage des Collèges, &c.* Par M. l'Abbé Théron. This work has reached its third edition in about a year, has been approved by the Archbishop of Paris, and universally admired, as presenting instruction in a form at once concise, solid, and agreeable.

*Explication de la Doctrine Chrétienne, en forme de Lectures.* 2nd edit. 2 vols. 12mo. 6f. This is a new arrangement of Couturier's *Catéchisme Dogmatique et Moral*, which, in sixteen years, has gone through six editions, of 6000 copies each, in France alone. The pre-

sent modification has reduced it to half its bulk, without essentially impairing its value.

*Jurisdiction de l'Eglise sur le contrat de mariage.* Par un ancien Vicaire-général. 8vo.

#### PHILOSOPHY.

*Œuvres du Comte de Stolberg, traduites par une Société de Gens de Lettres.* Several volumes are published, and access may now be had to the rich intellectual stores of that illustrious convert by those who are unacquainted with the German language.

*La Raison du Christianisme.* Par M. de Genoude. The first edition of this work, in 8 vols. 8vo. has been exhausted, and the second has been condensed into three large volumes, with an accession of matter, at the price of 39fr. This work contains the sentiments of 196 writers—jurists, historians, philosophers, moralists, legislators, and warriors—on the harmony between science and religion. As a supplement or continuation of this work, M. de Genoude has procured a translation of Dr. Wiseman's "Lectures on the connexion between Science and Revealed Religion," the first volume of which has been announced for the end of March.

*De l'Unité, ou Aperçus philosophiques sur l'Identité des principes de la Science Mathématique, de la Grammaire générale, et de la Religion Chrétienne.* Par un ancien élève de l'école polytechnique. 2 vols. 8vo. 12fr. The author of this curious work is M. Etchegayen, an officer of artillery: he endeavours to discover the same principle of unity in the language of numbers, of speech, and of religion. God is thereby exhibited as the universal spirit, the universal word, and the universal force. No work which has lately appeared so completely proves the religious tendency of French science and literature at the present day. Even independently of its real merit, the work is valuable as a sign of the times.

*La Théorie de l'Ame.* Par Docteur. 1re partie, 8vo. 3fr. 50c. This work is a bold effort of untutored genius. Its author has passed his life in the country, supporting seven children by the labour of his hands. Without books or advice, amidst the distracting solitudes of poverty and affliction, he has plunged into the abyss of metaphysical speculation, to explain the mysteries of the human soul. "Man made to God's image," is his fundamental principle; but he illustrates and confirms it by a series of original and powerful reasonings, which show the connexion between it and the fundamental dogmas of revelation. It is a work of true genius, which unceasingly astonishes the reader by the striking views which at every step it presents. Its defects are such as result from the author's position—a want of polish and elegance, and an over-bold confidence in his views.

*Les Ruines Morales et Intellectuelles.* Par M. A. Nettement. The "Ruins" of Volney have possessed in France a pernicious celebrity. The present work may be considered as having seized its fundamental idea, and turned it to a virtuous purpose. The author does not sigh over the destruction of human grandeur, nor wickedly attempt to trace

it to the influence of religion. He stands in his <sup>own</sup> country, amidst the moral desolation which irreligious philosophy has caused, and calls up its authors to stand aghast at the cruel work of their own hands. Luther is summoned to see the excesses to which his first step of disobedience has led. His character is admirably described, with all that impetuosity and pride which made him at once scorn\* submission, and yet exact it with implacable violence; making him "one of those despots of liberty, who weigh so heavily on the people whom they pretend to free." Calvin, Carlostadt, Cranmer, and the other pretended reformers, are made to quail before the severe anathema which a heavenly voice pronounces upon their impious works. These form the advance-guard of the destructive host; the age last past is resuscitated, and its leader is thus described:—

"It was an old man, but there was on his forehead no line that expressed the gravity of age, or its venerable majesty. His look, piercing as the viper's sting, gave no indication of any particular age. He smiled, as he looked upon our ruins; but his smile expressed none of that tender benevolence, or that sorrowful pity, which rise in the mind at the sight of a great calamity. \*Sarcasm and irony broke from his looks in long fiery glances, and a mockery, cruel, implacable and bitter, was painted on his features. I felt a secret antipathy towards the man, and yet his eye bewitched me, and through an irresistible attraction I advanced towards him, divided between fear and desire, curiosity and horror."

Voltaire and his followers are made to witness the abominable scenes of the revolution, to the death of Louis upon the scaffold. Perhaps this work should have been placed by us among works of fiction; but we have considered it of a higher importance, from its being intended for education. It forms a portion of the *Bibliothèque Universelle de la Jeunesse*, a series which contains many beautiful and able performances. It proves the zealous efforts which enlightened catholics are making to christianize the rising generation, and at the same time to give it a habit of solid philosophical thought. This little work is full of rich poetic feeling and deep moral sentiment.

*Leçons de Philosophie sur les principes de l'Intelligence, et sur les causes et sur les origines des Idées.* Par M. Laromiguière. 5th ed. 2 vols. 8vo. 15fr.

We have seen with pleasure the announcement, that a society has been formed, under the direction of M. Charles Gosselin, for the publication of a series of works, under the title of *Le Christianisme illustré*. We need not add, that it will unite the soundest catholic principles with the most varied research.

A work, too, will shortly appear, which promises to possess great interest. Its title is, *Ou Chrétien ou Panthéiste*. The author, Léon Boré, is fully qualified for his undertaking, by a long residence at Munich. The object of the work is parallel to a course of reasoning well known in our domestic controversy. In the same manner that catholics have shown how there is no standing place between their religion and Socinianism, so M. Boré proves how the denial of Christian-



ity pushes the reason, by the successive impulses of necessary and connected consequences, into the admission of Pantheism, with all its dangerous practical effects. It is not by abstract reasoning that the author comes to this conclusion, but by an able and masterly simplifying review of the philosophical systems of Germany. From Kant to Flegel, their tendency to this form is clearly proved, wherever protestantism has degenerated into rationalism. We trust that this work will be extensively known in our own country.

*Examen des Questions scientifiques de l'Age du Monde, de la pluralité des Espèces humaines, de l'Organologie, &c., considérées par rapport aux Croyances Chrétiennes.* Par M. Forichon. 1 vol. 8vo. 6fr. 50c. The author is Doctor of Medicine, of the Faculty of Paris, and member of the French Geological Society, and of the Society of Natural Sciences. We think this a favourable opportunity to notice the paper read by M. Roys to the Academy of Sciences at Paris, September the 2nd, 1836, "On the probable antiquity and the revolutions of the globe." The conclusions to which he came were, that the age usually assigned by philosophers to the present condition of the earth was far too great; and that 4,200 years was about the period which sound geology must assign to it, since the last great revolution. This conclusion, we need hardly add, accurately corresponds with sacred chronology.

#### BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

A society has been formed in Paris, under the title of *Société Agiographique*, with a joint-stock capital of 500,000 francs, for the republication and completion, in Latin and French, of the Bollandist collection of Saints' Lives, known under the name of the *Acta Sanctorum*: In addition to this gigantic undertaking, three other works were proposed: first, the Lives of all French Saints, in six large 8vo. volumes, with a History of the establishment of Christianity in Gaul; secondly, Lives of the principal Saints, considered in relation to the history, the customs, and literature of their times; thirdly, a Biographical Dictionary of all the Saints. In November, the Minister of Public Instruction, having demanded a report of their proceedings, gave notice to the society, that he considered the undertaking entitled to the protection and encouragement of government. He accordingly requested the President of the Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs to apply to the Belgian government for permission to use the manuscripts left by the Bollandists. A great part of their materials are, in fact, ready for publication, as far at least as the end of October, at the 14th of which month their work closes. Two members of the society proceeded to Brussels, where the manuscripts are preserved in the Bibliothèque de Bourgogne. Before complying with the request, the King sent for the superior of the Jesuits, to whose society the Bollandists belonged, and inquired whether his order were disposed to undertake the continuation of the work; and if so, what would be the probable expense. He requested a few days to consult with the members of his order, and returned an affirmative answer. Individuals yet survive, who remember the last years of the Bollandists' labours,

and partook in them. The continuation will thus remain in the hands of the order which commenced the work, and the Belgian government, with its usual liberality, will defray the expense. This account we have received from a highly authentic source; but we trust that the French society will still continue its praiseworthy labours.

*Keepsake Religieux. Livre des Saintes*. 3rd edition. It contains, among others, the beautiful Life of the Blessed Virgin, by the Abbé Gerbet.

*Histoire de la Sainte-Vierge*. Par M. l'Abbé Orsini.

*Vie de S. Augustin*. Par \*\*\*, prêtre du diocèse de La Rochelle.

*Vie de Ste. Térése*. Par F. Collombet. 1 vol. 8vo. 4fr.

*Grégoire VII*. Par M. de Vidaillan. 2 vols. 8vo. 15fr. We have not been able to ascertain the spirit of this work, and therefore only notice it, *at present*, as a proof of the attention paid at this moment to the influence of religion on the character and events of the catholic ages. Since the publication of Voigt's German Life of this great and holy Pontiff, work has succeeded work upon his times and history; the accumulated calumnies of ages have been swept away, and his character has been brought out, not only pure, but brilliant as a chased vessel of gold which has passed through the fire. This is a theme to which we hope before long to return. In the mean time, we look forward with eager confidence to the long-promised Memoirs of that Pontiff by Villemain. His work, if we be rightly informed, as we have every reason to believe, was begun in a moment of disgust, and with no favourable leaning towards its subject. But truth, unexpectedly discovered, soon prevailed upon a mind like his; and we may fairly anticipate a new and powerful vindication of Hildebrand from the pen of this able writer.

*Deux Chanceliers de l'Angleterre; Bacon de Vérulam, et Saint Thomas de Cantorbéry*. Par A. F. Ozanam. 1 vol. 8vo. 5fr. We trust as little time as possible will be lost in translating this work into English; for its subject concerns us more than our neighbours. In studying the history of the sixteenth century, the author was struck with the profound and vast genius of Bacon, when confronted with the meanness and pusillanimity of conduct with which he disgraced his judicial robes. He remembered how the ermine had been equally worn by St. Thomas-à-Becket, "endowed like him with a great genius, but at the same time with invincible virtue. We recalled to mind," the author continues, "his laborious life, and his death, which was in truth a triumph; and our mind, which had assisted at the sorrowful spectacle of the philosopher's meanness, was rejoiced to meet upon its road the consoling memory of the martyr.

"This contrast, which had been made in our solitary meditations, and had forcibly struck us, seemed to us likely to interest our brethren, who believe and think as we do; and what we had noted we therefore endeavoured to write. Far is it from our thoughts to insult human nature, by exposing the disgrace of one of her noblest sons. The two personages whom we exhibit represent two principles, the rationalist and the Christian,—reason elevated to its highest power, and

faith exposed to the severest trials. We wish to examine which is the more fruitful in social welfare. We wish to measure a great man with a saint, so as to discover in which of the two human nature raises itself higher, and is crowned with greater glory. The parallel is not unfair. We have not chosen the least among the sages of earth: in Bacon, philosophy has done her utmost. We have not sought out the first among the sages of catholicity: there have been heads in the Church surrounded by a brighter halo than St. Thomas's. Neither is the comparison arbitrary: St. Thomas and Bacon bore the seals of the same empire, and were natives of the same country. In the age of the first, that country was called the 'Island of Saints;' in that of the second, it preferred to be called 'the land of free-thinkers' (*libres penseurs*): it had changed its title—we will see if the change was good."

This work does not consist of a mere fanciful parallel between these two distinguished men. It is divided into two parts, one containing the Life of Lord Bacon, the other the Biography of St. Thomas. The writer fully appreciates the great merit of the former, and defends him from the posthumous attacks of Count le Maistre. The Life of St. Thomas is perhaps the most complete that has yet been published. M. Ozanam has made considerable researches upon it, and been able to correct several inaccuracies, into which Michelet and Thierry had both fallen. He vindicates the conduct of Alexander III; and the management of this second portion of his task is well worthy of the dignity of his subject. His conclusion is glowing and poetical. He observes, that the life of Bacon is that of every philosopher; of Plato, at the court of Dionysius, and Aristotle at the feet of Alexander; of Cicero, dejected in exile, and Seneca flattering Nero; of Luther dispensing with the polygamy of the Landgrave of Hesse; and of Voltaire supping with Frederic of Prussia. The history of St. Thomas is that of all the saints; of Athanasius before Julian, Ambrose before Theodosius, Chrysostom before Arcadius, Gregory VII before Henry IV, Nepomucen before Wenceslaus, Fisher and More before Henry VIII, and Pius VII before Napoleon. In the one, we see the impotence of philosophy to raise man above human weakness; in the other, the power of faith and love to harden him against every earthly trial.

*Chronorama.* Two charts of Ancient and Modern History. 6fr. The second, which contains the period since the coming of Christ, may be considered a chart rather of ecclesiastical, than of profane history; as its columns contain—1st, The chronology of the Popes; 2nd, All councils, general, national, and provincial, with the number of bishops in each; 3rd, Religious and monastic institutes, and ecclesiastical rites; 4th, Ecclesiastical writers; 5th, Heresies and persecutions, &c.

*Chronologie historique des Papes, des Conciles généraux, &c.* Par M. Louis de Malastrie. 1 vol. 8vo. 7fr. 50c. This work is divided into three parts—on the Popes, general councils, and French synods. To each is prefixed an instructive and accurate dissertation on the subject of which it treats. Each part is in synoptical tables, drawn up with great attention; and the work is extremely useful as a book of reference.

*Introduction philosophique à l'Histoire générale de la Religion.* Par M. Perron, professeur de philosophie, &c. 1 vol. 8vo. 7fr. This work appeared shortly before the period from which we commence our review; but its increasing reputation since that time warrants us in giving it a place in our list. Few books have received such unqualified applause from the friends of religion in France, as this. The author, a young man of powerful mind, makes bold profession of his religion. "I declare," says he, "my attachment to the catholic faith, and condemn any thing in my book which may be contrary to it." This introduction to a larger, and, we doubt not, still more able work, gives a general view of the origin and causes of false religions, which bring the author to the conclusion, that the Catholic alone can lay claim to be considered the work of God. The breadth and nobleness of his views, the eloquence of his descriptions, and the elegance of his style, have been universally admired. Long and earnestly have we wished that the dearth of our own religious literature could be systematically supplied from the rich stores of the Continent. We cannot but believe that a sufficient number of subscribers would be found for the undertaking of a "Catholic Family Library," in monthly volumes; and where original works could not be supplied, translators would easily be found to furnish abundance of valuable materials from France, Germany, and Italy. Several works in this summary would well repay the labour of translation; and every six months would supply an equal number. Perron's Introduction would doubtless merit this distinction.

*Histoire Ancienne*, 2nd ed. *Histoire Romaine*, 2nd ed. *Histoire du Moyen Age*, 2nd ed. Par M. E. Lefranc. 3 vols. 12mo. These works are abridgments for the use of schools, but of a character very different from such publications in general. Instead of imitating those shallow, dry, and flippant narratives, M. Lefranc seizes on the leading events of each epoch, and describes them with an interesting vigour which bears his youthful reader along. But what forms his chief recommendation is, that religion is ever kept in view. A strong moral principle prevails through his work: he does not fix the eye of his pupils so much on heathen Rome, as on the city of martyrs and of pontiffs. He treats the middle ages with the same spirit, and, with no false compassion for their faults, traces the important influence of the holy wars upon the civilization of Western Europe.

*Les Derniers Bretons.* Par E. Souvestre. 2nd ed. 4 vols. 8vo. Brittany has been almost an unknown land for the rest of France. It is inhabited by a different race, possesses a different language, and presents physical characteristics of another nature. The author of this work has done justice to his native land, to its beauties, its traditions, and the noble character of its people. The most interesting feature in this to our taste, is the unalterable attachment they have shown to their religion and to its ministers, in spite of every persecution. Brittany is to France what Ireland is to Britain; for, in fact, the inhabitants of both are of one race. M. De Souvestre has furnished several feeling anecdotes of this intrepidity of religious attachment. When the revo-

lution strove to crush religion by oppression, and to destroy it by the guillotine, it found in La Vendée a spirit of resistance, nowhere else displayed; for the body of the people was united in one sentiment. "I will throw down your steeples," said an agent of this persecution to the *maire* of a village, "that you may have no object to remind you of your old superstitions." "You will always be obliged," answered the noble rustic, "to leave us the stars; and we can see *them* further off than our spires." Who that has travelled in Ireland has not noticed the practical prevalence of the spirit which prompted the threat, in the jealousy which there, as in England, has reserved the "tall bully" steeple to one worship, as though fearful it might recall to mind the existence of the other.\* But we will not indulge in reflections; we will rather relieve the tediousness of cataloguing, by giving two of M. De Souvestre's anecdotes.

'At the height of the persecution, when the priests were proscribed, the inhabitants of Crozon found it impossible to receive the consolations of religion; even the neighbouring villages were filled with revolutionary troops. The ingenuity, however, of the bold people, discovered a way to defy pursuit or annoyance, if not discovery. When midnight strikes, a point of light appears on the horizon of the ocean, and the tinkling of a bell is faintly heard amidst the roaring of the deep. At the well-known signal, there issue from every creek and sheltered nook, along the shore and river, numerous fishing-boats, crowded with men, women and children, and glide in silence and darkness towards a common point. At the same time the distant light becomes gradually brighter, and the sound of the bell more distinct as they approach to meet them; it is a larger vessel, on the deck of which an altar is raised, and a priest stands ready to begin mass. Surrounded by a congregation of two thousand persons, who kneel in their frail, unsteady barks, he goes through the solemn service, baptizes the children, marries their youth, and administers the sacraments to all.—Upon reading this narrative, a thought has struck us, fruitful, we think, in beautiful sentiment: what a development of strength Catholicity has received, when the same persecuting power which of old drove it to burrow in the catacombs, has, in these times, sent it to seek security upon the open, restless, boundless bosom of the ocean, the fittest emblem of its vastness and its might.' Nor will its power prove less, whenever unjust political persecution drives it unwillingly upon the troubled waters of political strife.

The second anecdote is of a more tragical character; but M. de Souvestre pledges himself to its truth. It was announced to the authorities that several parishes had arranged, one night in May, to make the annual procession round the fields, to call down a blessing from heaven upon them, under the guidance of a refractory priest, as

---

\* A friend of ours who was particularly struck with the disproportionate height of the spires of many of our Protestant country churches in Ireland, compared to the insignificant body which clung to them, described them, in horticultural phrase as "churches which had run to steeple."

he was styled. Two companies of national guards were silently stationed on either side of a deep hollow road, along which the procession must pass. After an hour of silent expectation, a distant chaunt was heard. "It is they," exclaimed their commander, "kneel, and attend to the command." The voices gradually grew more distinct, the priest sang aloud the Litany, and the crowd responded. As they entered the defile, the banners appeared above the hedges, and nearly touched the guns of the patriots; and the appropriate verse was singing, "From sudden and unprovided death, O Lord deliver us; from the snares of the devil, O Lord deliver us;" when the stilled command, "Present!" passed along the ranks. "From anger, hatred, and all ill-will, O Lord deliver us"—"Fire!"—and a hundred and fifty shots fell with dreadful advantage upon the pious company. Each end of the road was now closed up by a detachment, and a murderous fire was kept up, till, with a desperate effort, they broke through all resistance, and forced their way.

We have almost forgot the humble duty of reporters, which at present we are discharging, and shall perhaps be blamed for lingering so long upon a work, interesting to us from an association of feeling, which others, of perhaps greater merit, do not possess.

*Dernière Epoque de l'Histoire de Charles X.* Par M. de Montbel. 50c. We speak not of this work in its political bearings; under this aspect it could not enter into the present list; but, as containing an example of the power which our holy religion possesses of soothing sorrow and calming the hour of death; as the history of a prince, who, whatever difference of opinion there may be concerning him when on the throne, must, by all, be honoured in exile for the virtues he there displayed, it is worthy not only of our notice, but of our warmest commendations.

*Origines de l'Eglise Romaine.* Par les Membres de la Communauté de Solesmes. Tome I. 4to. 15fr.—We hail this splendid volume with delight. The Benedictines, its authors, have only been four years established in France, under the protection of the Bishop of Mans, and have certainly lost no time in again taking up the habits of their Maurist predecessors. Their labours have begun precisely where we could have wished them. Perceiving, as we learn from one of the zealous community, that the reaction, as it is called, in favour of the literature of the middle ages, might lead to neglect of a more important period, they have consecrated their first fruits to the centre of Catholic unity, by tracing out, with equal ability and learning, its early history. The entire work will be a history of the Holy See, from St. Peter to the ninth century; and will enter fully into the life and manners of the early Christians, and their remaining monuments. The work, in addition to its intrinsic merit, has, technically speaking, been "got up" in an admirable manner.

#### TRAVELS.

*Pèlerinage à Jérusalem et au Mount Sinai.* Par le R. P. Marie-Joseph de Gérantib, religieux de la Trappe. 3 vols. 8vo. 22fr. 50c.—Who

that is versed in the annals of fashion, or that has read the witty poems of Moore, is not familiar with the name of Baron Géramb? Well was he known in London, for his noble form and social qualities, as he mingled in all the gaieties and dissipation of the Regency. Twenty years of monastic severity among the Trappists, and of edification to all France, have given proof of the sincerity of his conversion, and of the power of grace, which could work such an effectual change. The Baron, of a noble Austrian family, rich, and fond of pleasure, had returned to Germany, from the visit to England which we have mentioned, when he was arrested by Napoleon, upon a neutral territory, and cast into prison at Vincennes. Here he met several bishops, in chains for their religious firmness, and with them the venerable F. Fontana, afterwards a cardinal. His conversation greatly led to inspire the Baron with contempt for the world; and as soon as he recovered his liberty, he entered into the severe order of which he is now so bright an ornament. The revolution of 1830 produced a cruel persecution against these truly philanthropic men; and F. Géramb, driven from his convent, fulfilled a wish he had long entertained, of visiting the Holy Land. We need not add, that in his travels, the pious devotion of the hermit is united with the good taste of the polished and educated mind. The Queen of the French has lately presented him with a superb ivory crucifix, in token of her respect and esteem.

*Lettres sur l'Italie, considérée sous le rapport de la Religion.* Par M. Pierre de Joux. 2nd edition.—This gentleman was a Protestant clergyman, President of the Consistory of the Loire, who made his abjuration in 1825. His letters are addressed to a young English nobleman, and are principally intended to combat the prejudices with which Protestants visit that country. They are full of enthusiasm and fine feeling; and gladly would we see them translated.

*Souvenirs de Voyage, ou Lettres d'une Voyageuse malade.* 2 vols. 8vo. 12fr. These letters are likewise from Italy, written by a noble lady to her own family, without any view to publication. How different from our "Rome in the nineteenth Century, by a Lady!" The Countess looks on every thing with a Christian eye, with a deep love of her religion; and intersperses her letters with reflections that would do credit to any scholar.

*Histoire d'une Promenade en Suisse.* Par M. Frédéric Dollé. 1 vol. 8vo. 7fr. 50.—This work has been announced as in the press. The author has already distinguished himself by his *Histoire des six Restaurations Françaises*.

#### ART, LITERATURE, POETRY, AND WORKS OF FICTION.

*Essai d'une Philosophie de l'Art, ou Introduction à l'Étude des Monuments Chrétiens.* Par Cyprien Robert. 1 vol. 8vo. 5fr. Our Review has already occupied itself with the principles of Christian painting, in analyzing the excellent work on the subject by M. Rio. This by Robert is more general in its subject, as it embraces the three sister arts—architecture, sculpture, and painting. It is at once theoretical

and historical, and combines the results of diligent study with the impressions of much personal observation.

*Nouveau Traité de la Narration et de l'Analyse Littéraire.* Par Alphonse Fresse-Montval. 2nd edition. 2 vols. 12mb.—This little work, intended for education, deserves a place here, both for the ability with which it is executed, and the purity of sentiment which pervades it. The entire course of rhetorical and poetical instruction is co-ordinate with a vein of religious sentiment; and the examples chosen, and the judgments given, are all conducive to nourish virtue and piety.

*Bibliothèque Universelle de la Jeunesse.* No mother who wishes to instruct her children, while young, in the French language, should be without this work. It is a series of short treatises, drawn up by scientific and learned men of the first eminence, and suited to the capacity of children. History is under the direction of Michaud and Guiraud; the natural sciences under that of Geoffrey de Saint-Hilaire, &c.; the arts are by Raoul-Rochette and Lebas; and literature by Count Walsh, Nettement, Emile Deschamps, &c. We have already mentioned the *Ruines*, one of the series: all the rest are in the same religious and moral feeling. *La Dévotion réconciliée avec l'Esprit* proves, by interesting examples, how false is the idea that deep devotional feeling is incompatible with high cultivation of mind or a lofty genius. *Tableaux des Fêtes Chrétiennes*, by Viscount Walsh, is a charming little volume, full of poetry and feeling. It contains tales illustrative of the spirit of the Christian festivities. *Poésies dédiées à la Jeunesse*, par M. A. Guiraud, de l'Acad. Fran. These poems are deeply religious.

We do not know a better symptom of the literary re-action, as it has been called, in France, than the number of poems and works of fiction which daily issue from the press, written in a religious spirit. We cannot do justice to this division of our subject, but must be content to give little more than the titles of works. The genius of Lamartine has awakened echoes in the breast of many a youth; and, in spite of his unaccountable defection from the purity of his first thoughts, many continue to follow the footsteps of his early career. The last few months have not been barren of religious poetry.

*Amertumes et Consolations.* Par Sager Noel. These are the confessions of a youthful spirit, who has tasted of the bitterness of unbelief, and drowned it in the sweets of religious repentance. In verse, the natural language of religious sentiment, he pours forth his gratitude to the power that has saved him.

*La Lyre du Léviite, Poésies Lyriques tirées de la Sainte Bible.* Dieu et la Patrie, *Poésies Lyriques tirées de l'Histoire de France.* Par A. L. Rieuks. 2 vols. 12mo. 3 fr. 50.

*Prières et Souvenirs.* Par Alexander Courvez. 1 vol. 8vo. Another young poet, who fearlessly attributes all his inspiration to the influence of religion, and consecrates his genius to its service. His style is simple, but full of natural pathos.

*La Vie Intime; Poésies.* Par M. A. De Latour. 2d ed. Faith and love are the muses of this youthful poet. In his preface, he boldly



avows his hope that the return to pure Catholic feeling will soon be universal.

*Pierre Gringoire.* Vers publiés par Paul Delassalle. Pierre is a character of melancholy notoriety in Victor Hugo's romance. Under the name of his last descendant, the editor has given his own sentiments, which are everywhere Christian.

*Enosh.* Prologue par Gustave de la Noue. 1 vol. 8vo. 6 fr. 50. This is a prologue to a long Christian poem, and is divided into three parts, Eden, Jerusalem, and Josaphat, or the creation, redemption, and end of the world. It was announced for the 15th of last month.

*Nouvelles Chrétiennes.* Par M. D\*\*\*: published by the *Société des Bons Livres*.

*Christophe Sauval.* Par M. Emile de Bonnechosc. 2 vols. 8vo. 15 fr. The scene of this romance is La Vendée in 1830. Its tendency and spirit are highly moral.

*Picciola.* Par M. X. B. Saintine. 1 vol. 8vo. This simple unpretending tale has a beautiful purpose. It is the demonstration of God's providential power and wisdom from the history of a little flower. A philosopher in prison at Fenestrelle beguiles his hours in watching the growth of a flower which has sprung up between the flags of his court-yard, and discovers, every day, new proofs of design and intelligence in the laws which govern it. The attachment which he gradually forms to almost the only object which cheers his solitude, mildens and softens his heart, and prepares it for receiving the seed of Christian virtue. Both his mind and soul are thus reclaimed and improved by the study of the lowliest of God's works.

*Arthur.* Par M. Ulric Guettinguer. This romance is more deeply religious than any of those belonging to the same school. Its subject is substantially the same as that of St. Beuve's beautiful romance, *La Volupté*, in which is described the conversion of a youth from the most abandoned course to a life of piety in the ecclesiastical state. Arthur is a more aged offender, who, from a mocking, licentious infidel, becomes a sincere and virtuous Catholic. The means attributed to Divine Providence for this purpose are the most simple, and consequently the most natural and probable. In the touching hour of sorrow, when the paroxysm of passion is interrupted, he attends the church of his little town. The deep devotion of the people, the rich pathos of the service, and, more than all, the convincing truth of the Nicene creed, opens his soul to the saving action of Divine grace. Although the hero may be imaginary, his history is that of many in modern France, where a religious regeneration has begun, and a new life is daily springing up from the decayed and mouldering trunk of the old philosophy. But on this head we may have occasion to treat more at length.

#### WORKS OF DEVOTION AND RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

*Œuvres Complètes de Saint François de Sales.* 16 vols. 8vo. This collection contains several works inedited till now. M. Blaise, to whose unwearied diligence it is due, has restored those before pub-

lished to their original form, and even preserved the archaisms of style which they contained before the alterations of recent editors. Another complete edition of this saint's works has been lately published as part of the *Panthéon Littéraire*. It is in 4 vols. 8vo.

*Instructions Edifiantes sur le Jeûne de Jésus-Christ.* Par Madame \*\*\*. 1 vol. 18mo.

*Manuel Catholique.* Par M. l'Abbé Thérion. 1 vol. 18mo. 2 fr. 50. This book, though principally intended for places of education, may be useful for all Catholics, as it contains, divided into five parts, prayers for every usual act of Catholic worship.

*Explication des Messes de l'Encyclopede de Paris.* Par M. Le Courtier.

*L'Unique Chose nécessaire, ou Reflexions, Pensées, et Prières pour mourir saintement.* Par le R. P. Marie Joseph de Géraumb. 2d ed. 1 vol. 12mo. 4 fr.

*Le Consolateur des Affligés et des Malades.* Par M. l'Abbé Martin de Noirliu. 1 vol. 12mo. The author was called to attend a young invalid, by his pious sister. His kindness was at first repulsed, but at length was crowned with success by the edifying death of the youth. For his use these meditations were originally written; and they may well serve as a manual in the hands of every clergyman when called to administer consolation to the aged or infirm, and of all who are suffering illness or sorrow.

We here close our summary review, in which, probably, are many omissions. We shall endeavour to make our next more perfect. To the clergy there are two works which we beg particularly to recommend, but which, from their complex character, we hardly know where to class. The first is the *Bibliothèque Ecclésiastique*, publishing in 150 vols., at 4 fr. a volume, with six years credit for payment. About forty have appeared; and four are published each month. The collection contains every thing which a clergyman can want. Scripture, with commentary, 20 vols.; theology, 10; dictionary of theology, 6; cases of conscience, 4; treatises of the fathers, 15; church history, 12; saints' lives (Butler's), 10; canon law, 3; discipline, with texts of councils, 4; Liturgy, 1; controversy, 6; sermons, 15; catechetical, 6; ascetic writers, 12; history, biography, literature, arts, sciences, &c., 26. The office of this useful publication is 58, Rue de Vaugirard, Paris.

The second work to which we alluded is the *Université Catholique*, of which we have more than once spoken in our former numbers. They who desire to know and appreciate the great modification which religious science has undergone on the Continent, and the new, original, and interesting aspect in which Catholic intellect has placed every branch of human knowledge, will find their wishes satisfied by the perusal of this periodical course of lectures, which embraces every variety of subjects.

We purpose, in our next Number, to give a condensed review of the religious publications of Germany and Italy, so to return to those of France after six months. By this alternate course, we trust we shall be able to keep our readers in pace with the Catholic literature of the Continent. When occasion permits, we shall be willing to enlarge our

bounds, and inform them of any interesting publication not likely to be noticed by other journals.

We will not, however, delay two literary notices till then, which possess more interest here than in the country to which they immediately belong.

Probably some of our readers may have seen or heard of a work published last year in London, in Italian and English, entitled *Le mie confessioni a Silvio Pellico, da Guido Sorelli da Fiorentino*; *My confessions to Silvio Pellico, by Guido Sorelli, a Florentine*. This work was sent into the world with all the recommendation of typographical luxury, and received the usual puffs from the anti-Catholic papers. We examined it, and found it beneath notice, save inasmuch as the author had daringly associated Pellico's name and portrait with his own. This trick, we thought, might lead the incautious to imagine that some friendship existed, or that some sympathy might be supposed to exist, between the two. Under this fear, we requested a common friend to inform Pellico of the circumstance, and suggest the propriety of his expressing his sentiments concerning it. Whether this was his first information concerning the work, we do not know; we are satisfied with having to communicate the following declaration, dated Turin, 15th January, 1837.

"Having read a book published in London, entitled 'My confessions to Silvio Pellico,' the unfortunate author of which (Guido Sorelli, a Florentine of Catholic family) states that he has become a Protestant, and seems to suppose that I may approve of his apostacy, I deem it right to make the following declaration:—

"That I have never known the unhappy youth who has addressed his guilty book to me; and I earnestly pray that, making a deeper study of religion, and more worthily having recourse to the light of grace, he may learn that the foundations of the Catholic, Roman and Apostolic Church are unshaken, and may return to the bosom of that venerable mother, whom at present he disowns and outrages.

"I beg the editors of papers to be so kind as to publish this declaration.

(Signed) "SILVIO PELLICO."

Our second notice is, that a short course of Lectures has been delivered in Rome by the Very Rev. Dr. Wiseman, to a most numerous and respectable audience, and that in consequence of urgent requests, they will probably soon be published in this country. They related to the functions of Holy Week in the Catholic Church, particularly as performed in Rome. These were considered in their threefold relation with art, with history, and with religion. In the first part was shown the influence which they have exercised, directly and indirectly, upon the development, perfection, and principles of Christian art: this formed the subject of the first lecture. The second continued the subject by unfolding the artistic principles on which they are constructed, communicating such information as is necessary for appreciating the monuments of musical science which they alone have preserved. Lecture III considered these offices in their historical connexions, as belonging to different ages, and in their characters preserving and recording the

feelings and thoughts of Christianity in each epoch; or as the only surviving remains of rites once more common, but now elsewhere lost. Lecture IV treated of their religious action: first of society, then on individuals. The influence which they had exercised on civilization and the public welfare, was illustrated by many examples: and their power to call up virtuous and devout emotions in each one's soul, formed the appropriate subject of the concluding reflections. This manner of viewing the subject, is certainly new, and, if well treated, would not fail to be interesting.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### OPENING OF THE COLLEGE OF ST. PAUL'S AT PRIOR PARK.

THE public is aware that the College of St. Peter, established a few years ago at Prior Park, was designed principally for the primary or scholastic branches of education. The success attending this institution, and its many local advantages for a more extensive place of education, as well as the want of accommodation for the older ecclesiastical students, suggested the addition of another college for the prosecution of the higher studies, both ecclesiastical and secular, and for the supplying in a certain degree the want of a Catholic university. With this view the College of St. Paul's was erected. It is an extensive, handsome, and commodious building, containing fifty private rooms for professors and students, besides lecture rooms, library, exhibition room, chapel, &c. Like the College of St. Peter's, it is governed by an immediate superior, under the title of president, both institutions being subject to the regent and to the resident bishop.

The College of St. Paul, though in an unfinished state, had been partially occupied since the fire, which destroyed the previous residence of the professors. The building, being at last fully completed, the institution was solemnly opened on the 21st of November, 1836, the festival of the presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

The ceremony commenced with high mass, at which the bishop assisted pontifically. After mass a procession, consisting of fifty of the clergy and elder students in their appropriate costumes, followed by the bishop and his attendants, and these by the younger students and a number of visitors, proceeded from the chapel through the principal apartments to the exhibition room; the accustomed benediction of the house being in the mean time performed.

Here the bishops delivered the constitutions of the new college to the Very Reverend Dr. Brindle, Vicar General and Regent, with orders that the same should be forthwith promulgated; and having appointed the Rev. Dr. Gentili, President, and nominated the other principal officers of the college, his Lordship delivered to the assembly the following

#### ADDRESS.

*"Dearly beloved Brethren and Children in Jesus Christ.—I cannot express to you how anxiously and how ardently I have longed for this*

day. For nearly twenty years that I have laboured in the Western District, I have beheld with regret the gradual decline of the Catholic religion—a regret rendered the more poignant by the contrast of that religion's increase in every other district of England. But particularly during the last twelve years, that I have been honoured with the episcopal charge, have I not only keenly felt the spiritual distress of this extensive district, but have anxiously directed my attention to procuring it relief. Of the cause of the evil there could be no doubt. The imperfect way in which our missions have been supplied by foreign priests, who were often ignorant of the language of the country; or by the refugees and outcasts of other dioceses, whose education was frequently as defective as their conduct was disedifying, proved that the want of a diocesan clergy was the cause of our misfortunes, and that their only remedy was the erection of a diocesan seminary for the education of such clergy. Hence, my first determination upon succeeding to the government of this district, was to attempt, with the blessing of God, the establishment of such a seminary: in which undertaking I received, as you already know, the warm encouragement of the Supreme Head of the Catholic Church, and the charitable promise of assistance from all my episcopal brethren in England. But how to accomplish so great a work with such inadequate means? Truly, if I had consulted only the dictates of human prudence, I should never have made the attempt; and had I foreseen the numberless anxieties, oppositions, persecutions, and sufferings, which have followed from the attempt, I know not if I should have had sufficient courage to make it. But, thanks be to God, the work has been undertaken; the difficulties and the sufferings are so far past; and the ceremony we have this day performed is more than sufficient to remunerate me for a still greater portion, should such be reserved for me in the decrees of an all-wise Providence. The western district now possesses a seminary, for which it may be grateful; I had almost said, of which it may be proud. Combining, with more than usual convenience and comfort, every moral requisite as a place of clerical and secular education. Deservedly, then, may I rejoice in this day: and cordially do I feel convinced, that you, reverend and dear brethren, will rejoice with me and heartily return thanks to God for this signal proof of his merciful kindness.

"I will now address to you a few remarks on the nature and object of this institution. This College of St. Paul's is intended, as I have already observed, in the first place, as an episcopal seminary, a train applied by the Church to institutions of this kind, in order to signify that they are places in which the young plants, which are hereafter to adorn the Lord's vineyard, may attain sufficient strength to enable them to bear the storms of less sheltered situations, and the poverty of a harsher and more rocky soil. In them the mind is formed by literature, and the soul improved by habits of virtue.

"And first with regard to the cultivation of the mind: it is unnecessary to remark to you, that they who are intended to teach others, should themselves possess learning; and this in a degree proportioned to the state of education, amongst those with whom they may happen

to be thrown. Religion must necessarily suffer, particularly in these times of boasted learning, from an ignorant or ill-instructed clergy. However edifying their conduct, or eminent their virtue, they never can possess the influence over their flocks, which the interests of religion require they should possess, if they are not superior in learning as well as in virtue to those whom they instruct. For this reason, the Holy Ghost, speaking of the priesthood, says, 'Because thou hast rejected knowledge I will reject thee, that thou mayest not exercise towards me the priestly functions.' Hence, immediately after the death of the divinely-taught founders of the Christian religion, we find their successors in Italy, Greece, and Asia, establishing schools for the formation of the Christian philosopher and divine, which, though obscure and humble in their origin, gradually threw into the shade, and at last entirely eclipsed, the boasted institutions of Paganism. And when by degrees the primitive fervour of the faithful had abated, we find the most eminent pastors of the Church reviving the splendour of the episcopal seminaries. Thus, the great St. Augustine erected within his own residence an institution, on which episcopal seminaries have since been modelled. He strictly required of all whom he promoted to holy orders, that they should have studied a certain time in his seminary, in which among other regulations he enjoined that all should imitate the early Christians of Jerusalem, living in community and possessing nothing as individuals. Nor could all the obloquy and calumnies heaped upon him (and they were not few) induce him to relax the regulations of his seminary. He declared, that whoever refused to comply with them, should be erased from the list of his clergy. 'He may appeal against me,' says the Saint, "to a thousand tribunals; he may take sail against me to whatever country he pleases; he may be wherever he pleases, but with God's help I will take care, that wherever I am bishop he shall not be a clergyman. You have heard my determination." Similar regulations were adopted in the sixth century by the great St. Gregory, who established in his own house, on the Celian hill, a seminary for the education of the Roman clergy, whence he afterwards deputed those zealous and holy men, who became the converters of our Saxon ancestors and the apostles of England.

"Nor was England itself backward in the establishment of similar institutions. In the celebrated schools of Lindisfarne and York, the whole range of profane as well as sacred sciences was taught in great perfection, whilst the Hebrew language was well understood, and the languages of Greece and Rome were written and spoken with such facility and accuracy, that it was difficult, as venerable Bede informs us, to distinguish an English scholar from a native of those countries. Upon the revival of classical literature in the sixteenth century, we find the Church, through her organ, the general council of Trent, recommending to bishops the establishment, in every diocese, of episcopal seminaries, as the best bulwarks against the attacks of error, and the surest preservatives of Christian morality.

"When the great religious revolution of that period suppressed, or transferred to the possession of the Protestant Church, the noble semi-

naries, colleges, and universities, founded by our Catholic ancestors, religion in this country was preserved from total extinction by the establishment of a few colleges abroad, which, till the period of the French revolution, furnished the Catholics of England with a supply, however scanty, of able, well-educated, zealous, and saintly missionaries.

"It will be some time before religion recover the loss of these valuable institutions. Their connection with foreign colleges and universities gave them advantages in a literary point of view, which we cannot possess at home; and the example of so many venerable and pious clergy, with which every Catholic country happily abounds, contributed powerfully to the formation of the true clerical character, and to the acquirement of those sterling and sublime virtues, which ought ever to adorn it, and for which the missionaries of England were long so justly celebrated.

"The evil will, in great measure, be redressed, when the state of our missionaries shall be such, as to allow the ecclesiastical student to complete and digest his studies, and when our Episcopal seminaries shall be supplied with teachers and superiors, who can inspire the rising generation with a love for learning, and a zeal for piety, and the salvation of souls.

"I feel happy in the conviction, that this new seminary already possesses such teachers and superiors; nor will I allow my happiness to be damped by the slightest apprehension that any of its students will be indocile to their instructions, or backward in corresponding with their zealous exertions. Assuredly, my dear children, you possess advantages of every kind, which have not been common in this country since the loss of our foreign colleges. All that is wanted is your own individual exertion. The greatest scholars, indeed, have been usually made by individual exertion; and nothing great, either in learning or piety, is ever made without it. Let such exertion be cheerfully made, for the love of God and the good of mankind, and your success is certain; you will have the satisfaction of contributing to the restoration or augmentation of clerical literature and piety, and what is of infinitely greater importance, you will have the merit of advancing the honour of God, and the salvation of souls in this deserted portion of his vineyard.

"But learning, whether sacred or profane, is not the principal object which ought to engage the attention of the founders of ecclesiastical seminaries. Though the pious and edifying priest can do comparatively little good without the aid of learning, the learned priest can do still less without the aid of piety. As ministers of religion we are but mere helpers in the great work of conversion. We may plant, we may irrigate, but God only can give the increase.

"That minister of religion labours in vain, with whom God does not co-operate, and God will not co-operate with those who are not united with him by love. Hence the primary object of the ecclesiastical seminary is to form the heart to virtue; the second to store the mind with knowledge: in other words, its principal object is to make virtuous,

zealous, holy priests, who may become the teachers of the people, by example as well as by words, who may have a right to say with St. Paul, 'Be ye imitators of us, as we are of Christ.'

And how are such priests to be formed? Not by instruction only, but by practice: not by transient religious impressions, but by the steady and perseverant exercise of Christian virtue. We are all the creatures of habit, and particularly of habit contracted in early youth: 'a young man according to his way, even when he is old he will not depart from it.' Amidst the storms of passion, and the gusts of temptation, human frailty is apt to droop, if not supported by supernatural strength; but when so supported for a sufficient length of time, the tender plant becomes a robust tree, incapable of being bent from its acquired rectitude by any violence of the elements. In the seminary, the minister of religion must not only be formed to the duties of his future station, but he must be so confirmed in the habit of those duties, that the practice of them may cease to be painful and become even agreeable to him. Now what are the duties of the minister of religion? To be wholly devoted to the love of God for the sake of God himself, and filled with zeal for the salvation of mankind from the same principle of divine love. It is for him to stand between the porch and the altar, to avert from his people the vengeance of an offended Deity, and to draw down in its place unmerited benedictions. He is a disciple, an apostle of Christ; he is, or ought to be, the good shepherd whose own are the sheep, for every one of whom he feels an interested solicitude. Neither day nor night must his anxiety for their safety be relaxed: he must be prepared to carry the weak and infirm in his arms, and to seek with unceasing solicitude every wanderer from the field. Woe be to him, if he content himself with a cold task-like performance of the outward duties of a missionary, while his heart is far from God and his people. If he can bring no trophies of his zeal, save the keeping together the docile members of his flock, many an unhappy wanderer, that wanted but the aid of his shoulders to be borne back to the fold, will rise up in judgment against him, and the heavenly pastor will demand its blood at the hands of the slothful shepherd. But if such be the fate of the luke-warm minister of religion, what will be that of the dissipated priest, of the worldly-minded priest; of the priest, who, instead of converting his people from the evil of their ways, is perverted by them to the evil of theirs; who becomes a gossip, a detractor, a sower of discord, a model of disobedience; whose external appearance betokens a heart carried away by foolish vanity, and whose whole conduct breathes earth not heaven? Terrible, indeed, will be the fate of such unworthy pastors; and yet if we are not all such, we owe it principally to the exercises of the seminary, which correct and curb, till they eradicate and destroy, our natural propensity to indolence, vanity, and love of the world, and substitute in their place the contrary habits of industry, humility, and the love of God.

It is to form these habits of patient industry, ardent zeal, and never-failing charity, that the various regulations of the seminary tend. For this purpose are enjoined early rising, protracted prayers and medita-



tions, a scrupulous attention to the decent performance of divine worship, diligent study, well-regulated exercise, and extreme punctuality in every daily duty. But most of all is perfect obedience, whether to written rule or vocal command, enjoined, that pride and self-love may be eradicated from the soul, and the Christian disciple become conformable to his Divine Master, who, though equal with God, became subject to man; who came into this world not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him, who became obedient to death, even the death of the cross, and who bids us, if we would be his disciples, to take up that same cross and follow him. Bearing ever in mind, dear children, that such are the objects of the various regulations to which you are subjected, you will not only submit to them with patience, but you will rejoice that such facilities are afforded you for strengthening the weakness of your nature, and confirming in your souls those habits of virtue, which will constitute your chief happiness in this life, and procure for yourselves and others imperishable bliss hereafter.

“But the seminary, which we have this day solemnly opened, is not designed exclusively for ecclesiastical students. On the contrary, this college of St. Paul’s was formed with a particular eye to the education of the Catholic laity. It was suggested to me, nor can any one doubt the propriety of the suggestion, that the Catholic youth of this country have long laboured under a serious disadvantage, in being excluded from the public Universities, and in not possessing any adequate substitute for these essential institutions. For the secular student, the English Catholic Colleges have supplied the place of the school rather than the University. In them, the elements of the learned languages, as well as of mathematics, and some of the more useful sciences, have been ably taught; but the completion of these studies, and their application to the various purposes for which they are designed, have been, through necessity, too generally omitted. Yet it is certain, that studies merely elementary are of little use for the improvement of the mind. They are the instruments of wisdom, rather than wisdom itself; the keys which unlock the treasures rather than those treasures themselves. The learned languages poorly pay the labour of their acquirement, if they serve only to form the style, or to furnish the ornaments of quotation; they become invaluable to the philosopher, the divine, and the man of learning, when they are acquired in such perfection as to enable him to unfold with ease the hidden stores committed to their custody. The same may be said of some of the principal living languages. History, geography, and the various branches of natural science, are most useful, when employed as the ground-works of experimental wisdom. When to these are added the science which teaches correct reasoning, and regulates the operations of the mind, the knowledge of ourselves and of God, the principles of law, equity, and civil government; but, above all, the principles and foundations of true religion, with its tenets, its practices, and its tendencies, then, and only then, may the course of useful education be said to be complete. Can it be doubted that such an education will be most useful to the Catholic youth? May we not hope that it will prove the means of removing

what we have had so often occasion to lament, that unsteadiness of conduct, that unfixedness of principle, that timidity or want of skill, in defending against the ignorant or malevolent declaimer the sacred and immortal doctrines of truth? Could the Catholic youth, with such an education, fail to exalt in the estimation of others that holy religion, which they have had the happiness to inherit from their forefathers? Certain it is, that a few years spent in such cultivation of the mind, under a mild and mitigated collegiate discipline, suited to his future pursuits in life, would be more useful to the man and to the Christian, than the idle or listless manner in which those valuable years are too often employed.

“Such are the objects of the institution which we have this day solemnly opened. Let us trust that God, who has so far enabled us to establish it, will impart to it his blessing, and bring it to perfection. He alone can do the work. He will do it, if we merit the continuation of his favours by our upright intentions and unwearied exertions. Oh! let us, on this occasion, present our poor exertions, our humble selves, and our infant establishment, to HIM, and may he receive them, as he this day received in the person of the infant Mary the purest and most exalted of offerings that had ever adorned his temple, so that we may hereafter joyfully sing with the blessed Mother of the World’s Redeemer, ‘He that is mighty has done great things for me, and Holy is his name.’

“To her powerful protection, and that of the two glorious apostles, SS. Peter and Paul, the special patrons of this united establishment, as well as to the great St. Augustine, the founder of episcopal seminaries, and to his namesake the zealous apostle of England, I this day humbly and fervently recommend our undertaking. May they continually intercede for us before the throne of grace, whilst the blessed St. Michael, and all the heavenly host, guard us against the unceasing assaults of our enemies.

“Holy Mary, Mother of God, blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, St. Augustine, and all ye Angels and Saints of God, pray for us.—Amen.”

After the delivery of this eloquent address, the procession returned to the chapel, and the ceremony finished with a solemn *Te Deum*.

#### IMPORTANT LITERARY DISCOVERY.

A VERY valuable discovery has just been made in Arabic literature, by John Drummond Hay, Esq. second son of that very able and accomplished scholar, His Britannic Majesty’s Consul General for Morocco; and England has reason to congratulate herself on being now able to make such an important addition to the stock of ancient knowledge, through the untiring and anxious labours of one of her youthful but studious sons.

Mr. John Hay, through his knowledge not only of the Oriental, but of the Moghrebbin dialect of Arabic spoken in Morocco, has succeeded

In obtaining what had been entirely despaired of, after many years of intense research, by many European persons of diplomatic influence—a fine old copy of the *large* work of Ebn Batoota, one of the most valuable of the old Arabic geographers. Mr. John Hay's copy of this singularly rare production appears perfect, a few pages excepted; and this hiatus is not to an extent of any importance. This opinion is confirmed by a comparison of the various divisions of the work with the translation published by Dr. Lee in 1829, of a *small abridgment*, the only account that had yet been obtained by Europeans of Ebn Batoota's travels. In the year 1324 of our era, this native of Tangier proceeded on the Mecca pilgrimage, whence, passing through various intermediate countries which he describes, he visited Tartary, India, and China; and after twenty-nine years of the most extraordinary wanderings, returned home by a strange detour in central Africa, through Melli and Timbuctoo.

The late British Consul General, Mr. Douglas, about two months before the arrival at Tangier of his present successor, received a promise from Hadj Zaleb ben Gelool, then Vizier or prime minister of the Sultan, that we would cause to be made for Mr. Douglas a transcript of Ebn Batoota, which was to be conveyed to that gentleman as soon as possible. The present Consul General, Mr. Hay, on going to the ancient capital of Morocco, a few months afterwards, to present his letters of credence to the Sultan, reminded the minister of his former promise, which, with the true "*Punica fides*," that personage renewed to the British agent, who, however, has, until this present day, heard no more of the matter. Moreover, though he has perseveringly sent occasional messages to remind Ben Gelool of his promise, that minister has preserved an unbroken silence on the subject.

The fact is this, the people of West Barbary are ultra bigots in their faith; and while the Turk and the Persian will allow copies to be taken of any book whatever which they possess, and sell almost any, except, perhaps, some rare scroll of the Koran, the Moors hold it a grievous sin to communicate to the Christian a single page inscribed—no matter what the subject—with their letters, which, as a vehicle of their sacred law, are esteemed to have a holy nature.

Hence, also, every impediment is thrown by the Moors in the way of Christians who would learn their language; and the native Jews, as possessing the Spanish as well as the oral Arabic, are the only persons who can, in this most strange land, assist a foreigner to the attaining the dialect of the country. Of the oriental or classic Arabic, the Jews, in general, know absolutely nothing.

The Jewish race, moreover, still the most abused in Barbary, are fearful to teach the tongue, except by stealth; and official gentlemen, who have resided many years in the country, have never found more than perhaps one or two Jews who were willing to venture, at the same time that they were capable of undertaking, the task of teaching to write, or even to read, any Arabic at all. These curious circumstances are necessary to be mentioned, that the public may perceive how many difficulties have stood in the path of Mr. John Hay, while he toiled in acquiring the Moghrebbin dialect of the Arabic, as well as the Oriental;

and of the extraordinary and unceasing caution he has been obliged to exercise, in searching for such literary treasures as may yet lie buried among this degraded people.

His researches, in the present instance, have been crowned with a success of which he himself, as well as his friends, had utterly despaired. The celebrated Golius was sent with the Dutch ambassador to the court of Morocco in 1622, and he is recorded to have collected many Arabic MSS. then unknown in Europe. With this exception, every other scholar in oriental literature who has ever attempted to acquire Arabic MSS. in any part of Barbary, has had to lament a mortifying failure until now, and more especially in their attempts in obtaining the *large* work of Ebn Batoota, which has ever formed the especial object of their researches. Not only several learned oriental scholars, but many active agents of Christian states, have instituted eager research through all Barbary after that particular work, but more especially about forty years ago, when the attention of the literary world was recalled by Sir William Jones to the pursuits of oriental learning.

There is one point to which all those of the British public who feel a concern for the reputation or the national interest of their country, should be especially directed on the present occasion. Our consular and vice-consular agents in Barbary, and the East in general, are frequently called upon to perform duties of a difficult as well as delicate nature, sometimes involving the dignity as much as the nearest interests of the empire, in written correspondence or personal communication with the ministers of those powers to whom they are deputed. It is therefore obvious that public officers placed in such situations, should possess a knowledge of the language of the country. But what is the melancholy truth? That not one scarcely of our foreign agents knows a solitary word of the language of the court to which they are sent. And what are the consequences? Negotiations demanding dignity and energy of expression, delicacy of tact, and profound secrecy, are entrusted to Jews and foreigners, who sometimes are mercenary and venal, always most fearful of Mohammedan authority. Hence many of our plans have been defeated, because the Jewish interpreter either weakened the energy, or entirely altered the sense, of our agents' communications, through the fear of the punishment which might fall upon him, were he, a foreigner, to give utterance to the energetic declaration of a British consul; or to gain his own particular ends, or for the sake of a good bribe, helped to impede the advancement of the negotiation of his own employer. It is time, therefore, that England should employ on her foreign missions only such as understand the language of the country. We have a fearful interest at present in the Levant. Russia is looking to that quarter with an eager eye. Other powers are anxious to undermine British influence; and our national interests at all times, and under all circumstances, are never in better hands and more secure keeping than in those of our own countrymen. Let us hope, therefore, that the English government will invariably reward the diligence and labours of such young men of talent and industry as Mr. John Hay, by giving them the preference in all the foreign appointments which become

vacant. The East India Government has afforded the nation a useful lesson on this subject, as it requires all its civil servants to know the language of the country.

“GERALDINE; A TALE OF CONSCIENCE.”—A work of a highly controversial character, under this title, will appear in a few days. It is the production of a lady of great acquirements, who has recently become a convert to the Catholic faith, and who is nearly related to a well-known religious Baronet. “GERALDINE” may be regarded as an *exposé* of the motives which induced the amiable and accomplished authoress to enter the bosom of the infallible Church. The work, from the able manner in which the subject is handled, and the rank of the writer, is likely to produce a sensation in the religious world.

DR. WISEMAN AND THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS AT ROME.—*Rome, Feb. 4.* Yesterday, the 3rd instant, his Holiness paid a visit to the English College. He arrived at ten o'clock, with a numerous retinue; and was received at the door by his Eminence Cardinal Weld; the Right Rev. Dr. Macdonnell, Catholic Bishop of Trinidad; the Very Rev. Dr. Wiseman, the Rector; and other members of the establishment.

After visiting the Chapel, his Holiness ascended the stairs to a spacious apartment, where a throne had been erected, and there, in a manner the most affable, received the students and officers of the house. After inspecting the greater part of the College, his Holiness proceeded to the library, where an elegant collation had been prepared, of which he partook with the prelates of his suite. Cardinal Weld availed himself of the occasion to deliver to the Pope, on the part of the Catholics of London, a copy of the medal which was presented to Dr. Wiseman during his stay in England, in token of the high estimation in which his services in the cause of learning and religion were held. His Holiness requested to see the original medal, which had been beautifully executed by Mr. Clint. After attentively examining the medal, and the workmanship of the enamelled chain to which it was attached, and which his Holiness considered as favourable specimens of English art, the Pope placed them round the neck of Dr. Wiseman, with many expressions of kindness. After remaining an hour and a half, the Pope returned to his carriage, amidst the acclamations of a large crowd, which his presence had attracted. His Holiness again and again expressed his gratification at all he had seen, and the deep interest which he took in the welfare of this ancient establishment; and was assured, in return, that his kindness on the present occasion would be considered by all the English Catholics as a mark of his paternal feelings in their regard.

*Supplementary Note to the Article in No. III. upon the "Persecution of Catholics in Prussia"*

It is not usual for quarterly publications to enter into controversies—neither do we intend easily to depart from this rule. But when, at so early a period of our existence, the accuracy of our statements has been called in question, especially after having been copied into respectable papers, we feel it a duty to come forward in self-justification.

We were fully aware that most of our disclosures would be considered startling, and be unexpected. Prussia had long been held up as a "model state" in regard to toleration, and its policy towards the Catholics had been too wily for it easily to be detected, or for its admirers easily to give up their feelings in its favour. The Catholics have no means of raising their voices in self-defence, for the press is strictly under a government censure. An example of this hardship has occurred since our article was written. On the 30th of December last, the Gazette of Aix-la-Chapelle published an article on China, in which all the Catholic missionaries, whose accounts have been fully verified by every subsequent research, were treated as bigots and suspected writers; and Gutzloff, the Prussian Bible Society's missionary, declared the only man worthy of credit upon that country. The censor, Ludermann, of course, sanctioned the publication of this sweeping and atrocious calumny. Mr. Brender wrote an answer; but it was only inserted with a commentary by the editor. Mr. Nellisen then wrote a second reply, and took the precaution of sending his article to another paper. But the same censor, Ludermann, of course, refused the *imprimatur*! Mr. Nellisen remonstrated, and threatened to lodge a complaint against Mr. Ludermann; and, at last, his answer, *completely mutilated*, was allowed to appear. If, then, such obstacles are thrown in the way of Catholics, and such partialities are shewn, in controversies purely *historico-religious*, what may we expect in *politico-religious* matters? How is it possible that the Catholics can make themselves heard, or appeal to Europe against the treatment they experience? So strict is the surveillance on this head, that any paper out of the kingdom, which takes their part, and exposes the artful policy of the Berlin cabinet, is sure to be interdicted. The "*Univers*," an upright, fearless, and able Catholic French paper, has been most zealous in this task; and we have rejoiced to see its views in accordance with our own, though no communication had taken place between us on the subject. The consequence has been its announcement, on the 17th of March, that all its numbers have been sent back from the Prussian frontier, with these words stamped in red upon the address, "*Prohibé en Prusse*." The "*Journal Historique*" of Liège, which has generously undertaken the same cause, has, we suppose, undergone, or will undergo, the same fate. We consider it, then, an act of generosity, or rather of justice, to lend our aid to those who, under oppression, are compelled to be silent. Not so the Prussian authorities. They have papers at their devotion in every part of the Continent; the gazettes of Frankfort, Hamburgh, the Hague, and other places, are their organs. Some of our

readers may remember an interesting letter inserted in the *Chronicle* in the course of last summer, complaining, in the name of the Prussian Catholics, of the system under which they lived, and of the erroneous impressions existing in England concerning their state. This communication was immediately attacked at great length by the *Hague Journal*, and soon after, this reply was abridged in the *Frankfort paper*, under the head of Berlin, 22nd August, 1836. We were not; therefore, surprised that, on the appearance of our article, a running fire should have commenced along the line of outposts to Prussian intolerance, especially after the notice taken of it by the daily press. The *Standard* and other papers copied their reply; and we proceed to notice it, as given in the *Hamburgh Gazette* of January 20. After the same general observations on the "misrepresentation of facts," as had been made in the *Chronicle* of last year, the writer comes to proofs. Never, in our idea, could the objection be granted to its full extent, with less danger to the assertion, than in this case. The article in the *Review* embraced a great variety of points, public and domestic; education, marriages, places of worship, employments, religious practices, proselytism, and many others. Upon most of these heads it quoted, as the *Chronicle* has observed, chapter and verse; it referred to orders of the day, and royal decrees, official instructions, and public documents. No attempt has been made to disprove the accuracy of the references, or the validity of the consequences drawn from them. On all these various and important topics, *except one*, no confutation is pretended, farther than telling us, that at "Berlin persons but superficially acquainted with the subject, must laugh at our ignorance." True, they will be precisely the persons superficially acquainted with the subject that will laugh; those who know it thoroughly will be more inclined to sigh at our *facts*. But what wonder if "at Berlin," men should laugh? The important question, in cases of hardship is, not whether he who inflicts, but rather whether he who suffers can laugh? If our article have reached the banks of the Rhine, and we shall learn that *there* we have been laughed at for our ignorance of the happy state of tolerant liberty enjoyed by the Catholics, we shall rejoice from our hearts, and make honourable apology for the error into which the documents issued by the Prussian government have led us—though we should then condemn them as unintelligible. But so long as we know that by them our statements are approved, we care not for the laugh of Berlin. We remember, since our boyhood, the sensible answer put into a frog's mouth by Sir Roger Lestranger, as addressed to boys who found it a laughing matter to throw stones at it—"This may be sport to you, but is death to us."

The only point on which an attempt is made to contradict our statements, is in regard to the admission of Catholics to public employments, military and diplomatic *only*. For even, on this head, we had spoken of a multifarious exclusion. The first of these two contested matters is proved, by a reference to the army list, which "will show the names of the best known Catholic families in all ranks in the army." It is then added, that "the late Field Marshal Gneisenau was a Catholic." The weakness of this exception, according to an old canon of school-logic,

confirms the rule. When it has been said, that the Dublin or other Irish corporations are, or were, exclusively Protestant, no one ever considered the assertion weakened by one or two extraordinary exceptions in favour of Catholics being admitted to them. It is not stated in reply to us, that *there is* actually any Catholic field marshal, or other officer in high command, but that sometime ago *there was one*! If living examples could have been produced, surely they would have been preferred. Now, be it remembered, that we spoke of the exclusive system of Prussia as a growing system, and as one which has lately taken its present form. That some time ago there was one superior officer a Catholic, and now there is none, surely confirms this our view. In the same manner, we cannot doubt, but officers who have served their time in the army have retained their ranks. But we showed how, *at present*, it is necessary for any one who aspires to military promotion to serve many years, and during this time to attend Protestant worship, and in a great measure to abstain from his own, if a Catholic; and this regulation certainly tends to keep conscientious Catholics from all chance of promotion. We should wish to abstain from all personal remarks, but we fear we are correct in observing, that the late Marshal Gneisenau, though a Catholic, brought up his family in the Protestant religion; and this sort of Catholics are pretty sure of patronage at Berlin,\* though we must disclaim them as exceptions in our favour.

The same remarks as we have made respecting the army will apply to diplomacy. With Prince Von Hatzfeld, and Prince Von Mettitz, we have no business at present; they are, and can only be, brought as examples, that Catholics *have been* employed as ambassadors. The living exceptions are three:—1st, Count Von Schaffyotach, "*ambassador* at Florence," as the paper calls him. Here is an incorrect assertion. There is no Prussian *ambassador* at that city, the gentleman mentioned is only a *chargé-d'affaires*, and that in subordination to the minister of Turin, to whom we believe he is councillor of legation. The other two are the *chargés-d'affaires* at Darmstadt and the ambassador to Greece. We are willing to allow these two, reserving the point for examination, whether Count Lusi be an ambassador in truth, or only like the one at Florence. To what does it after all amount? That two or three *third-rate* situations, not of ambassadors, or ministers, but of *chargés-d'affaires*, an office held often by the secretary of legation, have been conferred upon Catholics; though we are still without proof as to the time of their promotions. The ambassador of Greece, if an exception, is a solitary case, out of the many diplomatic agents employed by Prussia.

But against this set the exclusion of Catholics from every other situation, and take into account the relative numbers of the population professing the two religions, and see if any thing like proportion of patronage is kept. We were far from exhausting our materials in our last paper; we left plenty to say; and have since learnt new instances to confirm our assertions. As a set-off to what has been stated against us, we will give a fresh case. Mr. Fablkamp, chief president in Munster,

\* We have been assured, that the marshal was not known to be a Catholic till the close of his life.



had ever distinguished himself by the bold and zealous discharge of his religious duties as a Catholic. On a sudden, without any desire on his part, he was desired to retire on a pension, and was called to Berlin, without any situation. In the meantime, the Prince of Hildburghausen, had offered him the place of minister, with a promise, that he should find no obstacle to the discharge of his religious duties. Mr. Fahlkamp, wishing to accept of this offer, wrote as follows to the king. "Sire; Seeing that, as a Catholic, I am no longer able to serve beneficially your Majesty's Government, I beg to present my resignation." It was accepted, and Mr. Fahlkamp, universally regretted at Munster, has followed Jarke and Philips into the service of a strange country.

We have seriously deliberated whether we should condescend to notice the strictures upon our article given in No. IX of the "Scottish Monthly Magazine," of February last. The bullying magnificence of its threats of exposure, and the "muscular abortion" of its parturition, stand in ludicrous contrast together. We really almost feared, when we read the first paragraphs of the article, that we might have committed some serious slip, for which we were about to be chastised; but were soon set at ease, both by the style of the writer, and the substance of his replies. The writer gives three reasons for doubting the truth of our statements: first, that the work we reviewed "is anonymous, and does not even profess to be the work of a Prussian Catholic:" secondly, that Dr. Wiseman "is established at Rome, and is understood to be high in favour at the Roman court:" and thirdly, that the clergy of Prussia have of late shown a spirit of resistance to stretches of power on the part of Rome, and been therein—supported by the Prussian government!

We leave to the ingenuity of cleverer reasoners than ourselves, to work out the connexion between these three propositions, and the conclusion, that the statements of the Dublin Review on the Prussian policy, or one, the point chiefly controverted by this writer, are not correct. On the first head we will only remark, that plenty of reasons can be imagined why the authors of the "Beiträge" should suppress their names, especially if Prussian Catholics: our previous remarks will explain this: and secondly, that from the works being anonymous, the writer had no business to conclude to any one's ignorance of its authors, but his own. It happened to know who some of them are, for more than one hand has been engaged, and can tell him, for his satisfaction, that they are Prussian Catholics. His second motive of doubt we do not understand, unless it be meant as an insinuation that the individual named in it can be suspected, from his situation, of biasing this Review so wickedly, as to make it insert falsehoods. If this be his meaning, we refer the libeller to the first page of his own article, and beg his acceptance of his own remarks on "personal vituperation." The mean insinuation must hurt the character of the slanderer alone, or, where he is unknown, the publication which admits it. The third reason for doubt is as astounding as it is new. It only wants one thing to make it perfect,—truth. An instance of the Prussian bishops supported by the government against encroachments on the part of the Holy See, which can scarcely correspond with them; would be a phenomenon, of which we should have thanked the

writer to supply us just one little instance. Till this is furnished, he must be content, if his motive of doubt be to us a motive of incredulity.

After this triple argument comes its confirmations. The reserve is far more formidably arrayed than the main battle. First we are *over-ingenious* in our conclusions about mixed marriages, *therefore,—false* in our statements about the universities or other points! Had our facts regarding the first been proved inaccurate, the analogy might have been admitted; how it holds at present we do not see. Secondly, we are vituperative against the only Catholic member of a certain board, by saying that all its "chiefs, with one *nominal* exception, are Protestants." "What right," we are asked, "has the reviewer to assume that the profession of the individual he alludes to is not sincere?" When, we ask in reply, did we say that it was otherwise? When a person is said to be *nominally* of a religion, it signifies that he does not *outwardly* follow it. If one *call himself* a Catholic, but never goes to the worship of his Church, nor partakes of its ordinances at stated periods, he is a *nominal* Catholic, and no more. This was the case of the individual alluded to. He may believe, for aught we know, every doctrine of our Church, but so long as outwardly he does not follow its injunctions, he cannot be considered more than nominally its member.

But now comes the grand attack. What we wrote concerning the Prussian universities, is pronounced to "contain such gross and wilful suppression of truth, as imperatively calls for exposure." The passage is then quoted at length, and pronounced to contain "two deliberate slanders." What the author means, we cannot understand, for his explanation is, that "in this country we do not admit a work to have all the principles of modern infidelity, because it has been condemned at Rome." What does he mean by this? Dereser, a professed Catholic, who had been driven, for his immoral doctrines, from Lucerne and from Rottemburg, whose works had been condemned at Rome, a *tribunal acknowledged by Catholics*, is named *Catholic* professor at Breslau, *in spite of the bishop*; and it is a slander to say that he was not a most worthy and fit person! and he is said to have been named by a dignitary of the Church! So that because the Protestants of Scotland do not admit a condemnation of a work by Rome, it is quite right to name a person, so condemned, to teach the Prussian Catholics those doctrines, which an authority, admitted by them as supreme, has condemned as contrary to the creed! And our Scottish critic thinks it unreasonable and slanderous to say so. Our authority against Dereser was one who knew him well, and had to deplore, for years, the mischief done to his religious convictions by his teaching.

"Having removed this rubbish," says our commentator, "we now proceed to convict the reviewer or his informant, of wilful suppression of truth, with a view to convey false impressions." These are *grave* words: *conviction*, is a strong promise; *wilful suppression of truth* a heavy charge. Let us see either made good.

The quotation of our passage is long, and contains many assertions: of these, *one only* is attempted to be contested. In it we said, that for six millions of Protestants there were four exclusive universities,

besides Bonn and Breslaw.—Not denied. 2dly, That they were exclusively Protestants, not only in the theological, but in every other faculty.—Not denied. In fact, we have a new proof of the correctness of our assertion, in the following extract from “J. J. Sack’s Medical Almanack, for 1837,” (*Medizinischer Almanach*) Berlin, 1837, printed with the approbation of the Censure.—“The celebrated naturalist, Dr. Charles Theodore von Siebold, of Dantzig, has been refused leave to teach (*die venia docendi*) in the Medical Faculty of Königsberg in Prussia, on account of his professing the Catholic religion” (p. 20.) 3rdly, We asserted that the Chancellor Brackedorff and Professors Phillips and Jarke had been dismissed from their places, on their becoming Catholics. Not denied. We have now to add, that Jarke, too, has now left Prussia, and received employment at Vienna.—4thly, We said, that “for the Catholics, who are four millions, two half universities are sufficient: they possess no such establishment to themselves.” This is the point on which we have been guilty of “wilful suppression of truth:” and, reader! you are promised conviction of it.

The conviction is this: besides the universities, the Catholics have theological and philosophical faculties at Braunsberg and Munster; and have, moreover, four seminaries for their clergy! Now what is an university? A place of education, in which not only these two sciences are taught, but law, medicine, history, languages, &c. Of such establishments we spoke, and not of colleges. Every seminary in Italy has theological and philosophical lectures; but who would say that truth was suppressed by not enumerating them, when called on to give a list of universities? Of the four millions of Catholics in Prussia, no more than are intended for the priesthood can take advantage of them; those intended for other professions have only two half universities, directed by professors of their creed. Now according to our critic, the number of Catholic theologians who yearly conclude their studies, is 255. This will give, in the usual average, about 1000 ecclesiastical students in the establishments destined for them: what proportion is this to the youth to be educated, out of a population of 4,000,000? Thus ends this wonderful conviction; that enumerating the universities, where every branch of profane learning is taught, we did not enumerate establishments which are not universities.

Now it is our turn to make the charge of misrepresentation; we will not add the odious epithet *wilful*; for our aggressor was very solemn about our questioning a person’s sincerity: he, however, seems to have the right of knowing, or at least assailing motives. “In the other faculties of the universities” (besides the theological), he writes, “the career of advancement is, notwithstanding the assertion of the Dublin Review, alike free to all.” Our only assertion on this head related to the obtaining of chairs in the purely Protestant universities; so that any one reading this sentence, would conclude that Catholics were as admissible to them as Protestants. The writer, however, does not openly make such an assertion: he could not bring an instance. The case of Siebold is sufficient, to confirm our position. But to illustrate his assertion, he instances a.

man who was rising in the medical faculty, though a Catholic. What was he? Was he a professor? Did we ever insinuate that the Prussian government ill-treats the Catholics who study at Protestant universities, or not rather that it strives in every way to allure them to attendance? The rest of the article is taken up with extracts from Professor Dietrich's book on the Prussian universities. As they have nothing on earth to do with a single assertion in our paper, we shall take no notice of them. Instead of that, we will give one or two new facts connected with the liberality of this pet Protestant government, respecting Catholic education, especially in regard to the establishment so exultingly quoted.

On the 29th of January, 1834, a royal decree suppressed the Latin elementary school at Erfurt, which was Catholic, and joined it to the gymnasium of Heiligenstadt. This till now had been a mixed establishment; from henceforth it was to be exclusively Catholic; and the twenty Protestants who followed its course were to receive religious instruction from a clergyman, who received an indemnity for his trouble out of the funds of the ancient Jesuits' college. The college of Erfurt was to be exclusively Protestant. Here there was something like fairness and equal treatment. But shortly after, the small Lutheran congregation established at Heiligenstadt petitioned against the arrangement, and there on came forth a new decree, constituting two Protestant chairs in the gymnasium just given up to the Catholics!

Within a year the government has seized on all the property of the monastery of Paderborn; and will in future provide for the support of the students, as it does for its soldiers. Rations of corn, rice, and meal, have been publicly contracted for, for a year!

But we have just read a letter from Berlin, given in the Augsburg Gazette, which proves how little confidence is placed by the Catholic authorities in the professors appointed by government, even in the mixed universities. It states that the Archbishop of Cologne, Baron Droste de Vischering has just prohibited the students of the Catholic faculty of theology at Bonn from attending the lectures of any other professor than those of M. Klee, "who is distinguished by the number of his dogmatical works." The Archbishop certainly could not have made a better choice. Professor Klee is known for the learning, talent, and orthodoxy of his writings more than for their number. He has been the most strenuous opposer of the Hermesian system of theology, with which that university has been lately imbued. But the fact of such a decree issuing from the Archbishop, proves, as we before remarked, what little harmony exists between the pastors of the Catholic Church and those who are appointed to teach its clergy.

We must conclude this long, and, to us, tedious, note. In our article the acute critic discovers a hidden motive of an "unholy nature." It is "a secret struggle to stir up those of his (our) communion to aim at educating their children in strict exclusion from those of other creeds. We protest," he adds, "against such a system . . . we implore both Protestants and Catholics to guard their hearts against the admission of such a system." To which we answer heartily, "Amen!" Bless the writer! What is he after? Heaven knows that we are obliged enough to educate

our children in complete seclusion, and that we are left to struggle against poverty in our establishments, while the rich foundations of our ancestors are exclusively Protestant. Yes, against this exclusive system, on *both sides*, we protest; and we implore, with our Scottish ally, Catholics and Protestants no longer to permit it. Give us a share of Eton and Rugby, Winchester and Westminster, Oxford and Cambridge; and thwart the unholy aim of the Dublin Review to obtain for Catholics an exclusive system, which, to their cost, they already have! But really, in earnest, it is too bad to blame us for desiring such exclusiveness, when we are accused, on the other hand, of striving to have a community of goods with the rich exclusives of the Protestant universities.

To the editor of the "Scottish Monthly Magazine" we beg respectfully to give this advice,—not to allow boys to try their hands at "first essays," in his pages, if he value the reputation of his journal. Only such, we think, could have written the crude, braggart, but unsupported article which we have noticed. If he admit such productions again, we beg he will at least clear them first of insulting epithets, and unfounded attribution of unworthy motives.

---

It is intended, if possible, to give, in future, short notices, in the form of a critical summary, of such recently published works as may fall under observation, and which may not, at the time, appear to require a lengthened review.

---

*Note.*—The Editors do not consider themselves precisely identified with all the political opinions which may be expressed by any writers in the Review.

---

#### ERRATA.

Page 278, line 25, for "Professor Cheselden," read "Pott and Cheselden."  
 Page 292, last line from bottom of page, for "Wellington or Napoleon," read "Wellington and Napoleon."

END OF VOL. II.

LONDON:

C. RICHARDS, PRINTER, 100, ST. MARTIN'S LANE, CHANCERY CROSS.











